arXiv:1611.01406v1 [math.PR] 4 Nov 2016

The Loewner difference equation and convergence of loop-erased random walk

Gregory F. Lawler

University of Chicago

Fredrik Viklund

KTH Royal Institute of Technology

November 7, 2016

Abstract

We revisit the convergence of loop-erased random walk, LERW, to SLE_2 when the curves are parametrized by capacity. We construct a coupling of the chordal version of LERW and chordal SLE_2 based on the Green's function for LERW as martingale observable and using an elementary discrete-time Loewner "difference" equation. This coupling is different than the ones previously considered in this context. Our recent work on the convergence of LERW parametrized by length to SLE_2 parameterized by Minkowski content uses specific features of the coupling constructed here.

1 Introduction, set-up, and main results

1.1 Introduction

Loop-erased random walk (LERW) is the random self-avoiding path one gets after erasing the loops in the order they form from a simple random walk. In the plane, which is the only case we consider here, it was proved in [15] that LERW has a conformally invariant lattice size scaling limit, namely SLE_2. In this paper we revisit this in the case of chordal LERW, proving the result in a slightly different framework than [15]. We need the theorem in this form for our proof of convergence of LERW parametrized by length

to SLE_2 parametrized by 5/4-dimensional Minkowski content [16]. In order to describe our results we will first discuss the work in [15, 16] and then elaborate on the results of this paper.

The proof in [15] is based on a description of LERW viewed as a continuous curve in terms of Loewner's differential equation; see below. In the case of SLE_κ the Loewner driving process is $\sqrt{\kappa}$ times a standard Brownian motion. The main step is to show that the LERW driving process converges to Brownian motion with variance parameter 2. The way this is done is by first identifying a *martingale observable*. This is a lattice function which for a fixed lattice point is approximately a martingale with respect to the LERW. One needs to be able to approximate the observable well in rough domains by some continuum quantity with conformal symmetries. In [15] a discrete Poisson kernel was used as observable, converging in the scaling limit to a conformally invariant version of the usual Poisson kernel.

The martingale property translates via the Loewner equation to an approximate martingale property of the Loewner process. The argument produces an estimate on the variance of the increments and from this information one can couple with Brownian motion using Skorokhod embedding.

Our proof follows the same basic idea but is based on a different observable: the LERW Green's function, that is, the probability that the LERW passes through a given vertex inside the domain. (Since LERW is a self-avoiding walk this probability is also equal to the expected number of visits to the vertex, hence the terminology.) By the domain Markov property the Green's function evaluated at a fixed vertex is a LERW martingale. The approximation result, which is also important for [16], was proved in [2]. More precisely, that paper proves that the LERW Green's function properly renormalized converges with a polynomial convergence rate in the scaling limit to the conformally covariant and explicitly known SLE_2 Green's function. The theorem does not need assumptions on boundary regularity. Recall that the SLE_κ Green's function is the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ of the renormalized probability that an SLE_κ curve intersects an ε-ball around a given point inside the domain. The observable used in [15] is specific to LERW but the Green's function is not. Many of the estimates given here apply to other models as well, assuming one has established convergence to the appropriate SLE_κ Green's function with sufficient control of error terms. However, such a convergence result is presently known only for LERW.

LERW is a random self-avoiding walk on a lattice (we use $\mathbb{Z}^2$) and as such can be viewed either as a continuous curve traced edge by edge or as a sequence of Jordan domains obtained by removing the faces touched (and disconnected from the target point) when walking along the LERW. These

viewpoints are of course essentially equivalent but other considerations may make one more convenient than the other. For example, Jordan domains are often easier to work with analytically. In this paper we adopt the second point of view. We exploit a fundamental robustness of Loewner's equation: the analysis is based on a difference version of Loewner's equation which uses only mesoscopic scale information about the growth process. The difference equation does not require the conformal maps to come from a curve, only that the sequence of maps is generated by composing maps corresponding to small hulls of controlled diameter and capacity. There is still a discrete "Loewner process" representing the growth on a mesoscopic scale, up to a uniform multiplicative error. (But this process does not determine uniquely the evolution.) The resulting argument is in a sense more elementary. We explain how to compare solutions to the difference equation corresponding to nearby Loewner processes, and write down formulas for some of the usual important processes such as the derivative and conformal radius.

The difference equation also produces a coupling of the Loewner chains. From this one obtains quantitative estimates comparing the solutions but more work is needed to compare the actual growth processes. At this stage it is more natural to work with curves again. We work out the estimates along the lines of [5] (which discusses the radial case) utilizing a simple bottleneck estimate for chordal LERW given in [16].

The coupling constructed in this paper, while similar to previous such couplings such as the one in [15], differs from them in two important ways. The first is the use of square domains and the second is that it is Markovian for the coupled pair of LERW and SLE driving functions. The former is convenient for using convergence results such as [2] while the latter is crucial for the argument in [16].

We have tried to provide a reasonable amount of detail and to make the paper fairly self-contained with the hope that it will be read not only by experts but also as an introduction to these techniques.

1.2 Acknowledgments

Lawler was supported by National Science Foundation grant DMS-1513036. Viklund was supported by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation, the Swedish Research Council, the Gustafsson Foundation, and National Science Foundation grant DMS-1308476. We also wish to thank the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences where part of this work was carried out.

1.3 Discrete quantities

We now discuss the discrete quantities we will use. We want the setup to match exactly that of [16], so in this section there will necessarily be some overlap in the presentation.

- Let A be a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}^2$, and write $\partial_e A$ for the edge boundary of A, that is, the set of edges of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ with exactly one endpoint in A. We specify elements of $\partial_e A$ by a, the midpoint of the edge; this is unique up to the orientation. We write a_-, a_+ for the endpoints of the edge in $\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus A$ and A, respectively. Note that

$$a_-, b_- \in \partial A := \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus A : \operatorname{dist}(z, A) = 1\},$$

$$a_+, b_+ \in \partial_i A := \{z \in A : \operatorname{dist}(z, \partial A) = 1\}.$$

  We also write $e_a = [a_-, a_+], e_b = [b_-, b_+]$ for the edges oriented from the outside to the inside.

- Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the set of triples (A, a, b) where A is a finite, simply connected subset of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ containing the origin, and a, b are elements of $\partial_e A$ with $a_- \neq b_-$. We allow $a_+ = b_+$.

- let $\mathcal{S} = \{x + iy \in \mathbb{C} : |x|, |y| \leqslant 1/2\}$ be the closed square of side length one centered at the origin and $\mathcal{S}_z = z + \mathcal{S}$. If $(A, a, b) \in \mathcal{A}$, let D_A be the corresponding simply connected domain defined as the interior of

$$\bigcup_{z \in A} \mathcal{S}_z.$$

  This is a simply connected Jordan domain whose boundary is a subset of the edge set of the dual graph of $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Note that $a, b \in \partial D_A$. We refer to D_A as a "union of squares" domain, slightly abusing terminology.

- Let $F = F_{A,a,b}$ denote a conformal map from D_A onto $\mathbb{H}$ with $F(a) = 0, F(b) = \infty$. This map is defined only up to a dilation; later we will fix a particular choice of F. Note that F and F^{-1} extend continuously to the boundary of the domain (with the appropriate definition of continuity at infinity).

- For $z \in D_A$, we define the important conformal invariants

$$\theta_{A,a,b}(z) = \arg F(z), \quad S_{A,a,b}(z) = \sin \theta_{A,a,b}(z),$$

which are independent of the choice of F, since F is unique up to scaling. Also for $z \in \mathbb{H}$, we write

$$S(z) = \sin[\arg(z)].$$

Note that $(\arg z)/\pi$ is the harmonic measure in $\mathbb{H}$ of the negative real line and $\sin[\arg z]$ is comparable to the minimum of the harmonic measures of the positive and negative real lines.

- We write $r_A(z) = r_{D_A}(z)$ for the conformal radius of D_A with respect to z. This is usually defined for any simply connected domain D as $r_D(z) = \varphi'(z)^{-1}$ where $\varphi : D \to \mathbb{D}$ is the Riemann map with $\varphi(z) = 0, \varphi'(z) > 0$. We can also compute it from F by

$$r_A(z) = 2\,\frac{\text{Im } F(z)}{|F'(z)|},$$

which is independent of the choice of F.

- Given $N > 1$ and an analytic simply connected domain D containing 0 as an interior point, let $A_N = A_N(D) \in \mathcal{A}$ be the largest discrete simply connected set such that $D_{A_N} \subset ND$. We write $\check{D} = N^{-1} D_{A_N}$; this is a simply connected Jordan domain which approximates D from the inside and converges in the Carathéodory sense as $N \to \infty$. Notice that we are suppressing the dependence on N.

- A *walk* $\omega = [\omega_0, \ldots, \omega_n]$ is a sequence of nearest neighbors in $\mathbb{Z}^2$. The length $|\omega| = n$ is by definition the number of traversed edges.

- If $z, w \in A$, we write $\mathcal{K}_A(z, w)$ for the set of walks ω starting at z, ending at w, and otherwise staying in A.

- The simple random walk measure p assigns to each walk measure $p(\omega) = 4^{-|\omega|}$. The two-variable function

$$G_A(z, w) := p\left(\mathcal{K}_A(z, w)\right)$$

is the *simple random walk Green's function*.

- If $a, b \in \partial_e A$, there is an obvious bijection between $\mathcal{K}_A(a_+, b_+)$ and $\mathcal{K}_A(a, b)$, the set of walks starting with edge e_a, ending with e_b^R and otherwise staying in A. (Here and throughout this section we write ω^R for the reversal of the path ω, that is, if $\omega = [\omega_0, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_k]$, then $\omega^R = [\omega_k, \omega_{k-1}, \ldots, \omega_0]$.) We sometimes write $\omega : a \to b$ for walks in $\mathcal{K}_A(a, b)$ with the condition to stay in A implicit.

- We write $H_{\partial A}(a,b)$ for the total random walk measure of $\mathcal{K}_A(a,b)$. It is easy to see that $H_{\partial A}(a,b) = G_A(a_+,b_+)/16$ (this is sometimes called a last-exit decomposition). The factor of $1/16 = (1/4)^2$ comes from the p-measure of the edges e_a, e_b. $H_{\partial A}(a,b)$ is called the *boundary Poisson kernel*.

- A *self-avoiding walk* (SAW) is a walk visiting each point at most once. We write $\mathcal{W}_A(z,w) \subset \mathcal{K}_A(z,w)$ for the set of SAWs from z to w staying in A. We will write ω for general walks and reserve η for SAWs. We write $\mathcal{W}_A(a,b)$ similarly when a,b are boundary edges.

- The loop-erasing procedure takes a walk as input and outputs a SAW, the *loop-erasure* of ω. Given a walk $\omega = [\omega_0,\dots,\omega_n]$, we define its loop-erasure $\mathrm{LE}[\omega] = [\mathrm{LE}[\omega]_0,\dots,\mathrm{LE}[\omega]_k]$ as follows.

  - If ω is self-avoiding, set $\mathrm{LE}[\omega] = \omega$.
  - Otherwise, define $s_0 = \max\{j \leqslant n : \omega_j = \omega_0\}$ and let $\mathrm{LE}[\omega]_0 = \omega_{s_0}$.
  - For $i \geqslant 0$, if $s_i < n$, define $s_{i+1} = \max\{j \leqslant n : \omega_j = \omega_{s_i+1}\}$ and set $\mathrm{LE}[\omega]_{i+1} = \omega_{s_i+1} = \omega_{s_{i+1}}$.

  Note that if $e_a \oplus \omega \oplus e_b^R \in \mathcal{K}_A(a,b)$, then $\mathrm{LE}[e_a \oplus \omega \oplus e_b^R] = e_a \oplus \mathrm{LE}[\omega] \oplus e_b^R$.

- The loop-erasing procedure induces a natural measure on SAWs. We define $\hat{P}_{A,a,b}$, the "loop-erased" measure, on $\mathcal{W}_A(a,b)$ by

$$\hat{P}_{A,a,b}(\eta) = \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{K}_A(a,b):\ \mathrm{LE}(\omega)=\eta} p(\omega).$$

  One can also write this as

$$\hat{P}_{A,a,b}(\eta) = p(\eta)\Lambda_A(\eta), \tag{1.1}$$

  where $m(\eta;A) = \log \Lambda_A(\eta)$ is the random walk loop-measure of loops intersecting η and staying in A, see, e.g., Section 2 of [2]. This does not define a probability measure; indeed the total mass $\hat{P}_{A,a,b}[\mathcal{W}_A(z,w)] = H_{\partial A}(a,b)$. Let

$$\mathbf{P}_{A,a,b} = \frac{\hat{P}_{A,a,b}}{H_{\partial A}(a,b)}$$

  denote the probability measure obtained by normalization. This is the probability law of (chordal) *loop-erased random walk* (LERW) in A from a to b.

With these definitions in place, we can state the main result from [2], which we will make significant use of in this paper. We emphasize that no assumptions about the discrete domain A are made.

Lemma 1.1. *There exists $\hat{c} > 0$ and $u > 0$ such that the following holds. Suppose $(A, a, b) \in \mathcal{A}$ and that $\zeta \in A$ is such that $S_{A,a,b}(\zeta) \geqslant r_A(\zeta)^{-u}$, then*

$$\mathbf{P}_{A,a,b}\{\zeta \in \eta\} = \hat{c}\, r_A(\zeta)^{-3/4} S^3_{A,a,b}(\zeta) \left[1 + O\left(r_A(\zeta)^{-u} S^{-1}_{A,a,b}(\zeta)\right)\right]. \quad (1.2)$$

We have not estimated u except $u > 0$. For the rest of the paper we fix a value of u such that (1.2) holds. We can also write (1.2) using the SLE_2 Green's function for D_A which is further discussed in Section 1.4. Let

$$G_{D_A}(\zeta; a, b) = \tilde{c}\, r_A(\zeta)^{-3/4}\, S^3_{A,a,b}(\zeta),$$

for a specific (but unknown) constant $\tilde{c} > 0$ that will be defined later. We may rewrite (1.2) as

$$\mathbf{P}_{A,a,b}\{\zeta \in \eta\} = c_*\, G_{D_A}(\zeta; a, b) \left[1 + O\left(r_A(\zeta)^{-u}\right)\, S^{-1}_{A,a,b}(\zeta)\right], \quad (1.3)$$

where $c_* = \hat{c}/\tilde{c}$ is a positive constant whose exact value is unknown.

1.4 Continuum quantities

Recall that chordal SLE_κ in $\mathbb{H}$ is a random continuous curve $\gamma(t), t \geqslant 0$, constructed by first solving the Loewner differential equation which reads

$$\partial_t g_t(z) = \frac{2/\kappa}{g_t(z) - B_t}, \quad g_0(z) = z \in \mathbb{H}.$$

Here B_t is standard Brownian motion. We shall only consider $0 < \kappa < 8$ in this paper, and primarily $\kappa = 2$. The conformal maps $g_t(z)$ can be expanded at infinity as

$$g_t(z) = z + \frac{(2/\kappa)t}{z} + O(|z|^{-2}).$$

Then for each $t \geqslant 0$ we define the SLE_κ curve and trace by

$$\gamma(t) = \lim_{y \to 0+} g_t^{-1}(U_t + iy), \quad \gamma_t := \gamma[0, t].$$

This limit is known to almost surely exist for each t and to define a continuous curve $t \mapsto \gamma(t)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ growing from 0 to ∞ (see Section 2 for more information on the Loewner equation). This defines SLE_κ in the reference

domain $\mathbb{H}$ with marked boundary points $0, \infty$ and we extend the definition to any simply connected domain D with two marked boundary points (prime ends) a, b (we write (D, a, b) for such a triple) by transferring the curve by a Riemann map taking $\mathbb{H}$ to D, 0 to a, and ∞ to b. Using Brownian scaling, one can see that this is well defined if one allows for a linear time reparametrization.

The Green's function for SLE_κ in a domain (D, a, b) is defined by

$$G_D(z, a, b) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \varepsilon^{d-2} \mathbf{P}\left\{\mathrm{dist}(z, \gamma_\infty) \leqslant \varepsilon\right\} = \tilde{c}\, r_D^{d-2}(z) S_{D,a,b}^{\beta}(z),$$

where γ is chordal SLE_κ in D from a to b,

$$d = 1 + \frac{\kappa}{8}, \qquad \beta = \frac{8}{\kappa} - 1$$

is the dimension of the SLE_κ trace, and the SLE_κ boundary exponent, respectively, and $\tilde{c} \in (0, \infty)$ is an unknown κ-dependent constant. Here r_D and $S_{D,a,b}$ are defined in the same manner as for the union of squares domains D_A discussed in the previous subsection.

1.5 Statements of main results

Here we state the main result of this paper in a form which we use in [16]. See also Proposition 3.6 for the coupling of the Loewner processes and Lemma 3.7 for the coupling of the Loewner chains. These are important steps on the way to the main result and they are also used in [16]. Given parametrized continuous curves taking values in $\mathbb{C}$, $\gamma^1(t), t \in [s_1, t_1]$, and $\gamma^2(t), t \in [s_2, t_2]$, we measure their distance using a metric ρ defined by

$$\rho(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \inf_{\alpha} \left[\sup_{s_1 \leqslant t \leqslant t_2} |\alpha(t) - t| + \sup_{s_1 \leqslant t \leqslant t_1} |\gamma^2(\alpha(t)) - \gamma^1(t)| \right],$$

where the supremum is taken over increasing homeomorphisms $\alpha : [s_1, t_1] \to [s_2, t_2]$.

Theorem 1.2. *There exists $u > 0$ such that the following holds. Let D be an analytic simply connected domain with $a, b \in \partial D$ distinct boundary points. For each N sufficiently large there are $a_N, b_N \in \partial_e A_N(D)$ such that if η is LERW in $A_N(D)$ from a_N to b_N and $\check{\eta}(t), t \in [0, 1]$, is the continuous curve obtained by parametrizing $N^{-1}\eta$ by half-plane capacity (computed with F as above), then there is a coupling of $\check{\eta}$ and a chordal SLE_2 path $\check{\gamma}, t \in [0, t_{\check{\gamma}}]$, in D from a to b for which*

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\rho(\check{\eta}, \check{\gamma}) > N^{-u}\right\} < N^{-u}.$$

2 Discrete and continuous time Loewner chains

The Loewner differential equation is a continuous limit of a Loewner difference estimates. The difference estimates hold for sets more general than curves, and since we are dealing with "union of squares" domains, we will use the difference formulation. Here we will review the basics from [10, Section 3.4] and then we will give some extensions. It is important for us to be careful with the error terms.

We recall that a set $K \subset \mathbb{H}$ is a *(compact $\mathbb{H}$-) hull*, if K is bounded and $D_K := \mathbb{H} \setminus K$ is a simply connected domain. Let $h_K = \mathrm{hcap}(K)$, the (half-plane) capacity which can be defined in two equivalent ways:

- If B_t is a complex Brownian motion and $\tau = \inf\{t : B_t \in \mathbb{R} \cup K\}$, then
$$h_K = \lim_{y\to\infty} y\, \mathbf{E}^{iy} \left[\mathrm{Im}\,[B_\tau]\right].$$
- If $g_K : D_K \to \mathbb{H}$ is the unique conformal transformation with $g_K(z) = z + o_K(1)$ as $z \to \infty$, then,
$$g_K(z) = z + \frac{h_K}{z} + O_K(|z|^{-2}), \quad z \to \infty.$$

We write the error terms as o_K, O_K to emphasize that they depend on K; the error terms we write below will be uniform over all K. We recall that $h_K \leqslant r_K^2$ where
$$r_K = \mathrm{rad}(K) = \sup\{|z| : z \in K\}.$$
There is no lower bound for h_K in terms of radius only; however, there exists $c < \infty$ such that
$$h_K \geqslant r_K \, \max\{\mathrm{Im}\,(z) : z \in K\}.$$
Let
$$\Upsilon_K(z) = \frac{\mathrm{Im}\,[g_K(z)]}{|g_K'(z)|},$$
and recall that $2\Upsilon_K(z)$ is the conformal radius of D_K seen from z. The basic Loewner estimate [10, Proposition 3.46] is
$$g_K(z) = z + \frac{h_K}{z} + O\left(\frac{r_K\, h_K}{|z|^2}\right), \quad |z| \geqslant 2\, r_K. \tag{2.1}$$
By applying the Cauchy integral formula to $f_K(z) = g_K(z) - z - (h_K/z)$, we see that
$$g_K'(z) = 1 - \frac{h_K^2}{z} + O\left(\frac{r_K\, h_K}{|z|^3}\right), \quad |z| \geqslant 2\, r_K. \tag{2.2}$$

This is the starting point for the next lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *There exists $c < \infty$ such that the following holds. Suppose $U \in \mathbb{R}$; K is a hull with $r_K < 1/2$; $z = x + iy$; and let g, r, h, Υ denote*

$$g_{K+U},\ r_K,\ h_K = h_{K+U},\ \text{and}\ \Upsilon_{K+U},$$

respectively. Then $\operatorname{Im}[g(z)] \leqslant y$ and $\Upsilon(z) \leqslant y$. Moreover, if $\delta = r^{1/4}$, $h \leqslant \delta r$ and $y \geqslant \delta$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| g(z) - z - \frac{h}{z-U} \right| &\leqslant ch\delta^2, \\
\left| g'(z) - 1 + \frac{h}{(z-U)^2} \right| &\leqslant ch\delta, \\
\left| \operatorname{Im}[g(z)] - y\left[1 - \frac{h}{|z-U|^2}\right] \right| &\leqslant cyh\delta, \\
\left| \Upsilon(z) - y\left[1 - \frac{2h\sin^2\theta}{|z-U|^2}\right] \right| &\leqslant cyh\delta,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

In particular, if $\sin\theta \geqslant \nu$, then

$$\frac{\Upsilon(z)}{y} \leqslant \left(\frac{\operatorname{Im}(g(z))}{y}\right)^{2\nu^2} [1 + O(h\delta)]. \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. Since $g_{K+U}(z) = g_K(z-U) + U$, it suffices to prove the result when $U = 0$ which we will assume from now on. The first two inequalities follow immediately from (2.1) and (2.2), respectively. Taking imaginary parts in the first inequality and using $|z| \geqslant \operatorname{Im}(y) \geqslant \delta$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Im}[g(z)] &= y\left[1 - \frac{h}{|z|^2}\right] + O\left(h\delta^2\right) \\
&= y\left[1 - \frac{h(\cos^2\theta + \sin^2\theta)}{|z|^2}\right] + O\left(h\delta^2\right)
\end{aligned}$$

and since $y \geqslant \delta$ we get the third inequality. Since

$$\left|1 - \frac{h}{z^2}\right| = 1 - \operatorname{Re}\left[\frac{h}{z^2}\right] + O\left(\frac{h^2}{|z|^4}\right) = 1 + \frac{h(\sin^2\theta - \cos^2\theta)}{|z|^2} + O\left(\frac{h^2}{|z|^4}\right),$$

and $h/|z| \leqslant r$, we get

$$|g_K'(z)|^{-1} = 1 + \frac{h(\cos^2\theta - \sin^2\theta)}{|z|^2} + O\left(\frac{hr}{|z|^3}\right),$$

Combining, we get

$$\Upsilon_K(z) = y\left[1 - \frac{2h\,\sin^2\theta}{|z|^2} + O\left(\frac{h\delta^2}{y}\right)\right].$$

□

Suppose now we have a sequence of hulls of small capacity $K_1, K_2, \ldots$ and locations $U_1, U_2, \ldots \in \mathbb{R}$ determining a "Loewner process", so that, roughly speaking $K_j + U_j$ is near U_j. Let

$$r_j = r_{K_j}, \quad h_j = h_{K_j}, \quad g^j = g_{K_j+U_j}$$

and let

$$g_j = g^j \circ \cdots \circ g^1.$$

If $z \in \mathbb{H}$, we define

$$z_j = x_j + iy_j = g_j(z).$$

This is defined up to the first j such that $z_j - U_j \in K_j$. (Recall that K_j is located near 0.) A key fact (and the basis of the Loewner differential equation) is that the left-hand side of (2.1) depends only on h, U and not on the exact shape of K. This implies that if we have two sequences for which the capacity increments and Loewner processes, h_j and U_j, are close, then we would expect the functions φ_n to be close for points which are away from the real line. We give a precise formulation of this in the next proposition. To illustrate the idea, let us sketch a continuum argument first. Suppose $U_t, \tilde{U}_t$ are continuous, real-valued, defined on $[0, T]$, and write $\varepsilon := \sup|U_t - \tilde{U}_t|$. Write $g_t, \tilde{g}_t$ for the corresponding Loewner chains and $z_t = g_t(z) - U_t$ and $\tilde{z}_t = \tilde{g}_t(z) - \tilde{U}_t$. Suppose that $\delta \leqslant \min\{\text{Im } z_T, \text{Im } \tilde{z}_T\}$. If $G_t = g_t(z) - \tilde{g}_t(z)$, then

$$\dot{G}_t = \psi_t[-G_t + (U_t - \tilde{U}_t)], \quad G_0 = 0, \quad \text{where } \psi_t = \frac{a}{z_t\tilde{z}_t}.$$

By solving the ODE and using the definition of ε we have

$$|G_t| = \left|\int_0^t e^{-\int_s^t \psi_r dr}\psi_s(U_s - \tilde{U}_s)ds\right| \leqslant \varepsilon\int_0^t e^{\int_s^t |\psi_r|dr}|\psi_s|ds.$$

From here we integrate and then proceed by applying Cauchy-Schwarz' inequality: if $y = \text{Im } z$, then

$$\left(\int_0^t |\psi_r|dr\right)^2 \leqslant \int_0^t \frac{a}{|z_r|^2}dr\int_0^t \frac{a}{|\tilde{z}_r|^2}dr = \log\frac{\text{Im } z}{\text{Im } z_t}\log\frac{\text{Im } z}{\text{Im } \tilde{z}_t} \leqslant (\log(\delta/y))^2.$$

The identity comes from taking the imaginary part of the Loewner equation and the last estimate uses the definition of δ. Hence we get the estimate

$$|g_t(z) - \tilde{g}_t(z)| = |G_t| \leqslant c\,(\varepsilon/\delta)\,(y \wedge 1).$$

It is possible to estimate in terms of other norms relating U_t and $\tilde{U}_t$ and, as we will see, continuiuty is not necessary to assume.

Proposition 2.2. *There exists $1 < c < \infty$ such that the following holds. Suppose (K_1, U_1), $(K_2, U_2)\ldots$ and $(\tilde{K}_1, \tilde{U}_1), (\tilde{K}_2, \tilde{U}_2)$, $\ldots$ are two sequences as above with corresponding r_j, h_j, g^j, g_j and $\tilde{r}_j, \tilde{h}_j, \tilde{g}^j, \tilde{g}_j$. Let*

$$0 < h < r^2 < \varepsilon^2 < \delta^8 < 1/c,$$

and $n \leqslant 1/h$ and suppose that for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$|h_j - h| \leqslant hr/\delta, \quad |\tilde{h}_j - h| \leqslant hr/\delta,$$

$$r_j, \tilde{r}_j \leqslant r,$$
$$|U_j - \tilde{U}_j| \leqslant \varepsilon.$$

Suppose $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{H}$ and let $z_n = x_n + iy_n = g_n(z), \tilde{z}_n = \tilde{x}_n + i\tilde{y}_n = \tilde{g}_n(z)$. Then, if $y_n, \tilde{y}_n \geqslant \delta$,

$$|g_n(z) - \tilde{g}_n(z)| \leqslant c\,(\varepsilon/\delta)\,(y \wedge 1). \tag{2.5}$$

Moreover, if we assume that $y_n \geqslant 2\delta$ and make no a priori assumptions on $\tilde{y}_n$, then $\tilde{y}_n \geqslant \delta$ holds, and hence (2.5) follows in this case, too.

Proof. Note that $nh \leqslant 1$, and hence if $y \geqslant 3$, we know that $y_n \geqslant \delta$. Without loss of generality, we will assume that $y \leqslant 3$; for $y \geqslant 3$, we can use the fact that $\varphi_n - \tilde{\varphi}_n$ is a bounded holomorphic function on $\{\mathrm{Im}\,(w) > 3\}$ that goes to zero as $w \to \infty$, and hence

$$|g_n(z) - \tilde{g}_n(z)| \leqslant \max\{|g_n(s + 3i) - \tilde{g}_n(s + 3i)| : s \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Using Lemma 2.1, and that $r < \delta^4$, we see that for $j = 0, \ldots, n-1$,

$$z_{j+1} = z_j + \frac{h}{z_j - U_j} + O\left(h\delta^2\right), \tag{2.6}$$

$$y_{j+1} = y_j \left[1 - \frac{h}{|z_j - U_j|^2} + O\left(h\delta\right)\right],$$

and similarly for $\tilde{z}_j, \tilde{y}_j$.

Hence

$$y_n = y \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \left[1 - \frac{h}{|z_j - U_j|^2} + O\left(h\delta\right) \right] = y\left[1{+}O(\delta)\right] \exp\left\{ - \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{h}{|z_j - U_j|^2} \right\}.$$

Since $y_n \geqslant \delta$ and $y \leqslant 3$, it follows that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{h}{|z_j - U_j|^2} \leqslant \log(y/\delta) + O(\delta), \tag{2.7}$$

and similarly for $(\tilde{z}_j, \tilde{U}_j)$. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we see that,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{h}{|z_j - U_j|\,|\tilde{z}_j - \tilde{U}_j|} &\leqslant \left[\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{h}{|z_j - U_j|^2} \right]^{1/2} \left[\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{h}{|\tilde{z}_j - \tilde{U}_j|^2} \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leqslant \log(y/\delta) + O(\delta). \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Let $\Delta_j = z_j - \tilde{z}_j$. Let us first assume that $|\Delta_j| \leqslant \delta/2$. By subtracting the expressions in (2.6) for z_j and $\tilde{z}_j$, we see that

$$\Delta_{j+1} = \Delta_j + \frac{h\left(U_j - \tilde{U}_j - \Delta_j\right)}{\left(z_j - U_j\right)\left(\tilde{z}_j - \tilde{U}_j\right)} + O\left(h\delta^2\right).$$

This implies that there exists c such that

$$|\Delta_{j+1}| \leqslant |\Delta_j|\,\left[1 + \rho_j\right] + c\,\varepsilon\,\rho_j,$$

where

$$\rho_j = \frac{h}{|z_j - U_j|\,|\tilde{z}_j - \tilde{U}_j|}.$$

Integrating we get,

$$|\Delta_{j+1}| \leqslant c\,\varepsilon \sum_{l=1}^{j} \left(\rho_l \prod_{k=l+1}^{j} (1 + \rho_k) \right) \leqslant c\varepsilon(y/\delta).$$

The last inequality uses (2.8) and the identity

$$1 + \sum_{l=1}^{n} \left(p_l \prod_{k=l+1}^{n} (1 + p_k) \right) = \prod_{l=1}^{n} (1 + p_l).$$

Hence we see that

$$|\Delta_n| \leqslant c\,\varepsilon\,(y/\delta),$$

provided that the right-hand side is less than $\delta/2$. Since $y \leqslant 3$ and $\varepsilon \leqslant \delta^4$, this will be true if δ is sufficiently small.

For the final assertion, suppose that j is such that $\tilde{y}_j \geqslant \delta$. Then since $\varepsilon \leqslant \delta^4$, we can use (2.5) to see that $|y_j - \tilde{y}_j| \leqslant c(\varepsilon/\delta)y \leqslant O(\delta^4)$. Since $y_j \geqslant 2\delta$, it follows that $\tilde{y}_j \geqslant 2\delta(1-O(\delta^3))$. But $|\tilde{y}_{j+1}-\tilde{y}_j| \leqslant c'h_j/y_j \leqslant O(\delta^7)$. Consequently, as long as δ is sufficiently small, taking c larger if necessary, we can continue until $j = n$.

□

Corollary 2.3. *Suppose we make the assumptions of the previous proposition, but replace the condition $y_n \geqslant 2\delta$ with*

$$\Upsilon_n(z), \tilde{\Upsilon}_n(z) \geqslant 2(2\delta)^{2\nu^2},$$

where

$$\nu = \min_{0\leqslant j\leqslant n} \{\sin\left[\arg\left(g_j(z) - U_j\right)\right]\}.$$

Then the results still hold for δ sufficiently small.

Proof. Using (2.4), we see that for δ sufficiently small

$$\Upsilon_n(z), \tilde{\Upsilon}_n(z) \leqslant 2y_n^{2\nu^2}.$$

□

The next proposition, which is important for [16], gives a familiar representation of the derivative of the uniformizing map and a related geometric estimate.

Proposition 2.4. *There exists $1 < c < \infty$ such that the following holds. Suppose (K_1, U_1), $(K_2, U_2)\ldots$ is a sequence as above with corresponding r_j, h_j, g^j, g_j. Let*

$$0 < h < r^2 < \delta^8 < 1/c,$$

and $n \leqslant 1/h$ and suppose that for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$|h_j - h| \leqslant hr/\delta, \quad r_j \leqslant r.$$

Suppose $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{H}$ and let $z_n = x_n + iy_n = g_n(z)$. Then if $y_n \geqslant \delta$,

$$|g_n'(z)| = \exp\left\{-\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \operatorname{Re}\,\frac{h}{(z_j - U_j)^2}\right\}(1 + O(\delta)). \tag{2.9}$$

In particular, there is a constant c such that if

$$\nu = \min_{0 \leqslant j \leqslant n} \{\sin [\arg (g_j(z) - U_j)]\}, \tag{2.10}$$

then,

$$|g_n'(z)| \geqslant c \left(\frac{y_n}{y}\right)^{1-2\nu^2}. \tag{2.11}$$

Proof. By the chain rule and Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\log |g_n'(z)| &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} \log |(g^j)'(z_{j-1})| \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log \left| 1 - \frac{h}{(z_j - U_j)^2} + O(h\delta) \right| \\
&= -\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left(\operatorname{Re} \frac{h}{(z_j - U_j)^2} + O(h\delta) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the first claim. For the second assertion, note that (2.10) implies

$$-\operatorname{Re} \frac{h}{(z_j - U_j)^2} = -\left(1 - 2S_j^2\right) \frac{h}{|z_j - U_j|^2} \geqslant -\left(1 - 2\nu^2\right) \frac{h}{|z_j - U_j|^2},$$

where

$$S_j = \sin [\arg(g_j(z) - U_j]\,.$$

But in the proof of Proposition 2.2 we saw that

$$\exp\left\{ -\sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{h}{|z_j - U_j|^2} \right\} = (y_n/y)\,(1 + O(\delta))\,.$$

Combining these estimates finishes the proof. □

2.1 Reverse-time Loewner chain

In this section we consider a reverse-time version of the discrete Loewner chains. The estimates are completely analogous to the forward-time case discussed above and indeed could be concluded almost directly from them, so we will omit proofs and only state the needed results.

We associate with a hull K a conformal map,

$$f_K : \mathbb{H} \to \mathbb{H} \setminus K, \quad f_K(z) = z - \frac{h_K}{z} + o(|z|^{-1}),$$

and of course, $f_K = g_K^{-1}$.

Lemma 2.5. *There exists $c < \infty$ such that the following holds. Suppose $U \in \mathbb{R}$; K is a hull with $r_K < 1/2$; $z = x + iy$; and write f, r, h, Υ for $f_{K+U}, r_K, h_K = h_{K+U}$ respectively. Then* $\operatorname{Im}[f(z)] \geqslant y$. *Moreover, if $\delta = r^{1/4}$ and $y \geqslant \delta$, then*

$$\left| f(z) - z + \frac{h}{z - U} \right| \leqslant ch\delta^2,$$

$$\left| f'(z) - 1 - \frac{h}{(z-U)^2} \right| \leqslant ch\delta,$$

$$\left| \operatorname{Im}[f(z)] - y \left[1 + \frac{h}{|z-U|^2} \right] \right| \leqslant cyh\delta, \tag{2.12}$$

We will consider sequences (K_j, U_j), where the K_j are centered hulls as above and $U_j \in \mathbb{R}$ are the locations of the hulls. Let

$$r_j = r_{K_j}, \quad h_j = h_{K_j}, \quad f^j = f_{K_j + U_j}.$$

Also let

$$f_j = f^1 \circ \cdots \circ f^j.$$

and notice that

$$(f_j)^{-1} = g^j \circ \cdots \circ g^1.$$

We see that the situation here in a sense is more symmetric than in the continuum time case: There one has to consider a time-reversed driving term in order to use the reverse flow to represent the inverse of the uniformizing map. The actual inverse map satisfies a partial differential equation involving a ∂_z-derivative, and this is one of the reasons why it is convenient to work with the reverse-flow instead of the actual inverse maps.

If $z \in \mathbb{H}$, we define

$$z_j = x_j + iy_j = f_j(z).$$

This is defined for all positive j.

Proposition 2.6. *There exists $1 < c < \infty$ such that the following holds. Suppose (K_1, U_1), $(K_2, U_2) \ldots$ and $(\tilde{K}_1, \tilde{U}_1), (\tilde{K}_2, \tilde{U}_2), \ldots$ are two sequences as above with corresponding r_j, h_j, f^j, f_j and $\tilde{r}_j, \tilde{h}_j, \tilde{f}^j, \tilde{f}_j$. Let*

$$0 < h < r^2 < \varepsilon^2 < \delta^8 < 1/c,$$

and $n \leqslant 1/h$ and suppose that for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$|h_j - h| \leqslant hr/\delta, \quad |\tilde{h}_j - h| \leqslant hr/\delta,$$

$$r_j, \tilde{r}_j \leqslant r,$$
$$|U_j - \tilde{U}_j| \leqslant \varepsilon.$$

Suppose $z = x+iy \in \mathbb{H}$ *and let* $z_n = x_n+iy_n = f_n(z), \tilde{z}_n = \tilde{x}_n+i\tilde{y}_n = \tilde{f}_n(z)$. *Then, if* $y \geqslant \delta$, *and* y_n, $\tilde{y}_n \leqslant \delta$,

$$\left|f_n(z) - \tilde{f}_n(z)\right| \leqslant c\,(\varepsilon/y)\,(\delta \wedge 1) \tag{2.13}$$

and

$$\left|y|f_n'(z)| - y|\tilde{f}_n'(z)|\right| \leqslant c\,(\varepsilon/y)\,(\delta \wedge 1).$$

Proof. The last estimate follows from (2.13) using the Cauchy integral formula. □

Proposition 2.7. *There exists* $1 < c < \infty$ *such that the following holds. Suppose* (K_1, U_1), $(K_2, U_2)\ldots$ *is a sequence as above with corresponding* r_j, h_j, f^j, f_j. *Let*

$$0 < h < r^2 < \delta^8 < 1/c,$$

and $n \leqslant 1/h$ *and suppose that for all* $j = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$|h_j - h| \leqslant hr/\delta, \quad r_j \leqslant r.$$

Suppose $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{H}$ *and let* $z_n = f_n(z)$. *Then if* $y \geqslant \delta$,

$$|f_n'(z)| = \exp\left\{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \operatorname{Re}\,\frac{h}{(z_j - U_j)^2}\right\}(1 + O(\delta))\,. \tag{2.14}$$

In particular, there is a constant c *such that if*

$$\nu = \min_{0\leqslant j\leqslant n}\left\{\sin\left[\arg\left(z_j - U_j\right)\right]\right\}, \tag{2.15}$$

then,

$$|f_n'(z)| \leqslant c\left(\frac{y_n}{y}\right)^{1-2\nu^2}. \tag{2.16}$$

Remark. If an estimate such as (2.16) is known for one of the Loewner chains, the worst-case blow-up y^{-1} in the estimate (2.13) can be improved. This is not needed here so we will not give details, but see [8] for continuous time versions.

2.2 Expansion of the SLE Green's function

We consider now the SLE_κ Green's function which in the case $\kappa = 2$ equals

$$G_D(z, a, b) := \tilde{c}\, r_D^{-3/4}(z) S^3_{D,a,b}(z).$$

We shall later use the LERW analog as an observable to help proving convergence to SLE_2. For this, we need to understand how the scaling limit, that is, the SLE Green's function, changes if the domain is perturbed by growing a small hull. The computation is no more difficult for general κ so we will not assume $\kappa = 2$ here.

Let $z_\pm = i \pm 1$. Then

$$\sin[\arg(z_\pm)] = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}.$$

Lemma 2.8. *Suppose K is a hull, $r = r_K = \mathrm{diam}(K), h = h_K = \mathrm{hcap}(K)$, $U \in [-(rh)^{1/3}, (rh)^{1/3}]$, $z_\pm = i \pm 1$. Then,*

$$\mathrm{Im}\,[g(z_\pm)] = 1 - \frac{h}{2} + O(hr),$$

$$|g'(z_\pm)| = 1 + O(hr),$$

$$\sin\left[\arg(g(z_\pm) - U)\right] = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\left[1 \pm \frac{U}{2} + \frac{U^2}{8} - \frac{h}{2} + O(hr + r^3)\right].$$

Proof. We will show the result for z_+; the argument for z_- is identical. Let us write

$$w = g(z_+) = x + iy = |w|\, e^{i \arg w},$$

where $\arg w \in [0, \pi]$. Using (2.1),

$$x = 1 + \frac{h}{2} + O(hr), \qquad y = 1 - \frac{h}{2} + O(hr), \quad |w| = \sqrt{2} + O(hr).$$

Moreover,

$$\sin\arg w = \frac{y}{|w|} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} - \frac{h}{2\sqrt{2}} + O(hr), \quad \arg w = \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{h}{2} + O(hr).$$

Using (2.3) and the fact that $z_\pm^2$ is purely imaginary, we have

$$|g'(z_\pm)| = 1 + O(hr).$$

We now want to expand $\arg(g(z_+) - U) = \arg(w - U)$ up to $O(hr) + O(r^3)$. Proceeding directly by Taylor expansion becomes a bit involved, so we will first exploit the harmonicity. For the moment, let us assume that $U \geqslant 0$. Let $\psi(\zeta) = \arg(\zeta - U) - \arg(\zeta)$. By the maximum principle $\psi(\zeta)$ equals π times the probability that a Brownian motion exits $\mathbb{H}$ in $[0, U]$. Since ψ is a positive harmonic function, and $|z_+ - w| = O(h)$, we have

$$|\psi(z_+) - \psi(w)| \leqslant ch\,|\psi(z_+)| = O(hr),$$

that is, $\psi(w) = \psi(z_+)\,[1 + O(hr)]$. Hence, using the Poisson kernel for $\mathbb{H}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\arg(w - U) &= \psi(w) + \arg(w) \\
&= \psi(z_+) + \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{h}{2} + O(hr) \\
&= \int_0^U \frac{dt}{(1-t)^2 + 1} + \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{h}{2} + O(hr) \\
&= \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{h}{2} + \frac{U}{2} + \frac{U^2}{4} + O(hr) + O(r^3).
\end{aligned}$$

If $U < 0$, we need to consider the probability of hitting the boundary in $[U, 0]$, but the same basic argument shows that in this case

$$\begin{aligned}
\arg(w - U) &= \arg(w) - \int_U^0 \frac{dt}{(1-t)^2 + 1} \\
&= \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{h}{2} + \frac{U}{2} + \frac{U^2}{4} + O(hr) + O(r^3).
\end{aligned}$$

Doing the analogous computation with $z = z_-$ we get

$$\arg(g(z_\pm) - U) = \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{h}{2} + \frac{U}{2} \pm \frac{U^2}{4} + O(hr) + O(r^3).$$

Finally we use the elementary formulas

$$\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \varepsilon\right) = \sin(\pi/4)\,\left[1 + \varepsilon - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} + O(\varepsilon^3)\right],$$

and

$$\sin\left(\frac{3\pi}{4} + \varepsilon\right) = \sin(3\pi/4)\,\left[1 - \varepsilon - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} + O(\varepsilon^3)\right].$$

We conclude

$$\sin\left(\arg(g(z_\pm) - U)\right) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\left[1 \pm \frac{U}{2} + \frac{U^2}{8} - \frac{h}{2} + O(hr) + O(r^3)\right].$$

□

The expansion of the observable is an immediately consequence. We will use this result only with $\kappa = 2$, but we state it so that it can be applied to other discrete models converging to SLE_κ for $0 < \kappa < 8$ if the analog of (1.2) is known.

Proposition 2.9. *Suppose we are in the setting of Lemma 2.8. If* $0 < \kappa < 8$ *and*

$$\alpha = \frac{\kappa}{8} - 1, \quad \beta = \frac{8}{\kappa} - 1,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} &\Upsilon(z_\pm)^\alpha \sin^\beta(\arg(g(z_\pm) - U)) \\ &\qquad = \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\right)^\beta \left(1 \pm A_\kappa U + B_\kappa \left[U^2 - \frac{h\kappa}{2}\right] + O_\kappa(hr + r^3)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

where

$$A_\kappa = \frac{4}{\kappa} - \frac{1}{2}, \quad B_\kappa = \frac{8}{\kappa^2} - \frac{2}{\kappa} + \frac{1}{8}, \quad \Upsilon(z_\pm) = \frac{\mathrm{Im}\,[g(z_\pm)]}{|g'(z_\pm)|}.$$

3 Coupling the Loewner processes and Loewner chains

In this section we derive the basic coupling results relating the Loewner processes and the corresponding Loewner chains. The method we follow is the same as in [15] but we work with a different observable, namely the LERW Green's function, and with the discrete Loewner equation. In order to be able to use the results in [16] we also need to be more careful with measurability properties. The resulting coupling is different from the one of [15]. We will give quantitative estimates (in terms however of the unknown exponent u chosen so that (1.2) holds), but we have not bothered to optimize exponents.

3.1 Loewner process

We start with $(A, a, b) \in \mathcal{A}$, so that A is a lattice domain with marked boundary edges a, b. Recall that we write $F : D_A \to \mathbb{H}$ for a conformal transformation with $F(a) = 0, F(b) = \infty$. As we have noted before, there is a one-parameter family of such transformations F, so we will now fix one of them. We define

$$R = R(A, a, b, F) = |(F^{-1})'(10i)|$$

and note that R is half the conformal radius of D_A seen from $F^{-1}(10i)$. We will prove facts for (A, a, b) with R sufficiently large and we will not always be explicit about this.

Fix a mesoscopic scale h, defined by

$$h = R^{-2u/3},$$

where u is the exponent from (1.2). This is somewhat arbitrary, but we will use that $R^{-u} = O(h^{6/5})$.

Before going into detailed estimates, let us pause here and give an overview of the argument. We first grow a piece of LERW of capacity h; more precisely, we will stop it the first time its image in $\mathbb{H}$ has capacity h or reaches diameter $h^{2/5}$. (In [15] the analogous stopping time is defined slightly differently, in terms of the capacity increment and the driving term displacement.) But we shall prove that with very large probability the latter event does not occur. Indeed, since LERW is unlikely to "creep" along the boundary we expect the diameter of the increment in $\mathbb{H}$ to be of order $h^{1/2}$. So, we have a mesoscopic piece η_h of LERW of capacity (very near) h growing from a in A. The domain Markov property of LERW implies that for ζ sufficiently far away from η_h,

$$p(\zeta) = \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{E}\left[p(\zeta) \mid \eta_h\right]\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[p_h(\zeta)\right],$$

where $p(\zeta) = \mathbf{P}_{A,a,b}\{\zeta \in \eta\}$ and $p_h(\zeta) = \mathbf{P}_{A',a',b}\{\zeta \in \eta\}$ is computed in the smaller domain A' with the LERW piece η_h removed and with marked edges the "tip" of η_h and b. Using (1.2) we can express both sides of the equation in terms of the SLE_2 Green's function for D_A and $D_{A'}$ (both Jordan domains), and using Proposition 2.9 we can can expand $p_h(\zeta)$ in terms of the Loewner process displacement ξ. By doing this for two different choices of ζ we get two independent equations which allow us to show that $\mathbf{E}[\xi] = 0$ and $\mathbf{E}[\xi^2 - \mathrm{hcap}[\eta_h]] = 0$ up to a very small error of $O(h^{6/5})$. These are the two critical estimates.

This argument can then be iterated thanks to the domain Markov property. We do so enough times to build a macroscopic piece of LERW. The outputs are uniform estimates on the conditional expectations and conditional variances of the Loewner process displacements in the sense of a sequence of $\mathbb{H}$-hull increments and positions, exactly as in Section 2. The position displacements nearly form a discrete martingale (with a controlled error), and can, with some work, be coupled with Brownian motion using Skorokhod embedding. From the estimate on the variance of the displacement, we conclude that it is a standard Brownian motion.

3.1.1 One step

We begin by discussing the estimates for one mesoscopic increment of the LERW. Suppose η is a SAW chosen from the LERW probability measure $\mathbf{P}_{A,a,b}$ and that $A_j = A \setminus \eta^j$, where $\eta^j = \eta[0,j]$ is considered taking (microscopic) lattice steps. We introduce a stopping time $m = m_1$ depending on A, a, b, F as follows:

$$m = \min\left\{ j \geqslant 0 : \text{ hcap}\,[K_j] \geqslant h \text{ or } \text{ diam}\,[K_j] \geqslant h^{2/5} \right\}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $K_j = F(D \setminus D_{A_j})$ is the image in $\mathbb{H}$ of the LERW hull. (That is, the squares touched by the LERW together with those squares that are disconneced from b.) We define for $j = 0, 1, \ldots,$

$$t_j = \text{hcap}[K_j], \quad r_j = \text{diam}[K_j].$$

Using the Beurling estimate, we have the easy bounds

$$t_m \leqslant h + O(R^{-1}), \quad r_m \leqslant h^{2/5} + O(R^{-1/2}).$$

Given the definition of m we expect however that t_m is very close to h and that r_m is in fact very close to $h^{1/2}$.

Lemma 3.1. *There exist $0 < \alpha, c < \infty$ such that for R sufficiently large, if (A, a, b, F) are as above, then for $K > 0$,*

$$\mathbf{P}_{A,a,b}\left\{ r_m \geqslant K\, h^{1/2} \right\} \leqslant c\, e^{-\alpha K}.$$

Proof. We sketch the proof here; for details see Section 5. We consider m', the first j such that $\text{hcap}[K_j] \geqslant h$ or $\text{diam}[K_j] \geqslant 4\sqrt{h}$. The key step is to show that there exists uniform $\rho > 0$ such that with probability at least ρ, we have $\text{diam}[K_{m'}] < 4\sqrt{h}$. If this happens we stop; otherwise, we do the same thing on the new walk. The probability of doing this J times without success is at most $(1-\rho)^J$. If we have succeded within J steps than $\text{diam}[K_m] \leqslant O(J\sqrt{h})$. □

Note that $F(D_{A_m})$ is an unbounded simply connected subset of $\mathbb{H}$ and let g be the uniformizing conformal map normalized so that

$$g : F(D_{A_m}) \to \mathbb{H}, \quad g(z) = z + o(z), \quad z \to \infty.$$

We write

$$\xi = g(a_m)$$

and finally set $F_m = g \circ F$.

Lemma 3.2. *There exist $0 < \beta, c < \infty$ such for N sufficiently large and (A, a, b, F) as above,*

$$|\mathbf{E}_{A,a,b}[\xi]| \leqslant ch^{6/5}, \qquad \left|\mathbf{E}_{A,a,b}\left[\xi^2 - h\right]\right| \leqslant ch^{6/5},$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}_{A,a,b}\left[\exp\left\{\beta\,\xi\,h^{-1/2}\right\}\right] \leqslant c. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. Write $z_\pm = 10(i \pm 1)$ and $H = F^{-1}$. Then H maps $\mathbb{H}$ onto D_A. Let w, ζ_+, ζ_- be points in $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ closest to $H(10i), H(z_+), H(z_-)$, respectively. In case of ties, we choose arbitrarily. Note that the domain Markov property for loop-erased random walk implies that

$$\mathbf{P}_{A,a,b}\{\zeta_\pm \in \eta\} = \mathbf{E}_{A,a,b}\left[\mathbf{P}_{A_m,a_m,b}\{\zeta_\pm \in \eta\}\right]. \tag{3.3}$$

We will estimate the two sides of this equation. To keep the notation simpler we will write $z = z_\pm$ and $\zeta = \zeta_\pm$. We begin with the left-hand side for which we can use (1.2) directly. Recall that $R = |H'(10i)|$. By distortion estimates we know that

$$|F(w) - 10i|, |F(\zeta) - z| \leqslant O(R^{-1})$$

and

$$|F'(\zeta)|^{-1} = |H'(z)|\left(1 + O(R^{-1})\right).$$

Hence,

$$r_{D_A}(\zeta) = 2|H'(z)|\left(1 + O(R^{-1})\right), \quad \sin(\arg F(\zeta)) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} + O(R^{-1}).$$

It follows from (1.2) that

$$\mathbf{P}_{A,a,b}\{\zeta \in \eta\} = c_0|H'(z)|^{-3/4}\left(\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\right)^3 + O(h^{6/5})\right),$$

where we used that $R^{-u} = O(h^{6/5})$ and set $c_0 := \hat{c}\,2^{-3/4}$. We now estimate the right-hand side of (3.3). By the chain rule and distortion estimates,

$$r_{D_{A_m}}(\zeta) = 2\frac{\operatorname{Im} g(z)}{|g'(z)|}|H'(z)|(1 + O(R^{-1})),$$

$$\sin\left(\arg\left[g \circ F(\zeta) - \xi\right]\right) = \sin\left[\arg\left(g(z) - \xi\right)\right] + O(R^{-1}).$$

So, by (1.2)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}_{A_m,a_m,b}\{\zeta \in \eta\} \\
&\quad = c_0|H'(z)|^{-3/4}\left(\frac{\text{Im } g(z)}{|g'(z)|}\right)^{-3/4}\left(\sin^3\left[\arg(g(z)-\xi)\right]+O(h^{6/5})\right) \\
&\quad = 2^{3/2}\mathbf{P}_{A,a,b}\{\zeta \in \eta\}\left(\frac{\text{Im } g(z)}{|g'(z)|}\right)^{-3/4}\left(\sin^3\left[\arg(g(z)-\xi)\right]+O(h^{6/5})\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Note that $r = \text{diam}(K_m) \leqslant h^{2/5} + O(R^{-1})$ so there is a constant c such that $|\xi| \leqslant ch^{2/5}$ for h sufficiently small. Hence $O(hr + r^3) = O\left(h^{6/5}\right)$ and we can apply Proposition 2.8 with $\kappa = 2$ to get

$$2^{3/2}\left(\frac{\text{Im } g(z)}{|g'(z)|}\right)^{-3/4}\sin^3\left[\arg(g(z)-\xi)\right] = 1 \pm \frac{3}{2}\,\xi + \frac{9}{8}\,\left(\xi^2 - t_m\right) + O(h^{6/5}).$$

Using this, by combining (3.3) with (3.4), we see that

$$\mathbf{E}_{A,a,b}\left[\pm\frac{3}{2}\,\xi + \frac{9}{8}\,\left(\xi^2 - t_m\right)\right] = O(h^{6/5}).$$

These equations imply

$$|\mathbf{E}_{A,a,b}\left[\xi\right]| = O(h^{6/5}), \quad \left|\mathbf{E}_{A,a,b}\left[\xi^2 - t_m\right]\right| = O(h^{6/5}).$$

Using Lemma 3.1 we can conclude both that $t_m = h + o(h^{6/5})$ and the final assertion of the lemma.

□

Proposition 3.3. *There exist $0 < \alpha, C < \infty$ such that one can define on the same probability space a random variable ξ with the distribution $\mathbf{P}_{A,a,b}$ and a standard Wiener process W_t, and a stopping time τ for W_t such that $\xi - \mu = W_\tau$ where $\mu = \mathbf{E}_{A,a,b}[\xi]$. Moreover,*

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\tau\right] = \mathbf{E}_{A,a,b}\left[(\xi-\mu)^2\right] = h + O(h^{6/5}),$$

and if

$$W^* = \max\{|W_t| : t \leqslant \tau\},$$

then

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\exp\left\{\alpha W^* h^{-1/2}\right\}\right] \leqslant C.$$

Proof. This can be seen using Lemma 3.2 from the standard construction via Skorokhod embedding. The last inequality uses (3.2).

□

3.1.2 Sequence of steps

We start with (A, a, b) and F as before, and having chosen a mesoscopic scale h. We have defined a step in a sequence of 4-tuples $(A, a, b, F) \to (A_m, a_m, b, F_m)$ which corresponds to a mesoscopic capacity increment of the LERW. This process can be continued to define a sequence of 4-tuples. The estimates of Lemma 3.2 will hold as long as the conformal radii of the decreasing domains are comparable to that of A. By the domain Markov property this corresponds to a sequence of stopping times for the LERW path stopped at mesoscopic capacity increments.

Let us be more precise. We start with a LERW η in A from a to b and $\eta^j = \eta[0, j]$ as usual. We write $D_0 = D_A, D_j = D_{A_j}$. Set $m_0 = 0, m_1 = m$, where m is as in (3.1). Then for $n = 1, 2 \ldots$, and $j = 0, 1, \ldots$, we consider

$$K_j^n = F_{m_{n-1}}(D_{m_{n-1}} \setminus D_{m_{n-1}+j}), \quad K_j = K_j^1.$$

Define the stopping times

$$\Delta_n = \min \left\{ j \geqslant 0 : \operatorname{hcap}[K_j^n] \geqslant h \text{ or } \operatorname{diam}[K_j^n] \geqslant h^{2/5} \right\},$$

and define $m_n = m_n(h)$ by

$$m_n = m_{n-1} + \Delta_n.$$

Write

$$K^n = K_{\Delta_n}^n.$$

for the nth "hull increment". Then we consider

$$t_{m_n} = t_{m_{n-1}} + \operatorname{hcap}[K^n]$$

so that the squares visited and disconnected by the n first mesoscopic steps of the LERW, η^{m_n}, has capacity t_{m_n}. Also, set

$$r_{m_n} = \operatorname{diam}[K^n].$$

Let $g^n : \mathbb{H} \setminus K^n \to \mathbb{H}$ be the conformal transformation with $g^n(z) - z = o(1)$ and set $F_{m_n} = g^n \circ F_{m_{n-1}}$ and

$$g_n = g^n \circ g^{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ g^1.$$

We also define the "Loewner process"

$$U_n = F_{m_n}(a_{m_n}), \tag{3.5}$$

ith increments

$$\xi_n = U_n - U_{n-1}.$$

We choose the term Loewner process over the more standard "driving process/term" since while the SAW determines the U_n process, the converse is not true. Write also

$$H_n = F(D_{m_n}) \subset \mathbb{H}.$$

We continue this process until n_0, the first time n such that

$$r_{m_n} \geqslant 2 \qquad \text{or} \qquad t_{m_n} \geqslant 2.$$

Note that $n_0 - 1 \leqslant 2/h$ and that for $n < n_0$,

$$t_{m_n} < 2, \quad |U_n| \leqslant 2,$$

$$|(F_{m_n}^{-1})'(10i)| \asymp |(F^{-1})'(10i)| = R,$$

Using the Beurling estimate, we can see that for $n < n_0$, the mesoscopic increments satisfy

$$t_{m_n} - t_{m_{n-1}} \leqslant h + O(R^{-1}), \quad r_{m_n} - r_{m_{n-1}} \leqslant h^{2/5} + O(R^{-1/2}).$$

With very large probability, after n_0 iterations we have built a hull of capacity 2, as the next lemma shows. Let $\mathcal{F}_n$ denote the σ-algebra generated by $(A_0, a_0, b), \cdots, (A_{m_n}, a_{m_n}, b)$.

Lemma 3.4. *There exist c, α such that*

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{t_{m_{n_0}} < 2\right\} \leqslant ch^{-1}e^{-\alpha h^{-1/10}}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.1 there are constants α, c such that for $n = 1, \ldots, n_0$,

$$\mathbf{P}\left[r_{m_n} \geqslant h^{2/5} \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right] \leqslant ce^{-\alpha h^{-1/10}}.$$

Summing over n gives the lemma. □

Lemma 3.5. *There exists $c < \infty$ such that the following holds. There is $N_0 < \infty$ such that if $N \geqslant N_0$ and (A, a, b, F) is as above, then there is a coupling of η and standard Brownian motion $(W_t, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)$ and a sequence of strictly increasing stopping times $\{\tau_n\}$ for $(W_t, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)$ such that the following estimates hold:*

(*i.*)

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\max_{n \leqslant n_0} |\tau_n - nh| > ch^{1/5}\right\} \leqslant ch^{1/5}, \tag{3.6}$$

(*ii.*)

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\max_{n\leqslant n_0}|W_{\tau_n}-U_n|>ch^{1/10}\right\}\leqslant ch^{1/10},$$

(*iii.*)

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\max_{n\leqslant n_0}\max_{\tau_{n-1}\leqslant t\leqslant\tau_n}|W_t-W_{\tau_{n-1}}|>ch^{2/5}\right\}\leqslant ch^{1/10},$$

(*iv.*)

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\max_{t\leqslant\tau_{n_0}}\max_{t-h^{1/5}\leqslant s\leqslant t}|W_t-W_s|>ch^{1/12}\right\}\leqslant ch^{1/10}.$$

Moreover, if $\mathcal{G}_n$ denotes the σ-algebra generated by $\mathcal{F}_n$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_n}$, then $t\mapsto W_{t+\tau_n}-W_{\tau_n}$ is independent of $\mathcal{G}_n$ and the distribution of the LERW given $\mathcal{G}_n$ is the same as the distribution given $\mathcal{F}_n$.

Proof. Using Lemma 3.2 and the domain Markov property we see that there is a constant $c<\infty$ such if N is large enough, on the event $n_0\geqslant n$,

$$|\mathbf{E}\left[\xi_n\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right]|\leqslant ch^{6/5},$$

$$\left|\mathbf{E}\left[\xi_n^2-(t_{m_n}-t_{m_{n-1}})\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right]\right|\leqslant ch^{6/5},$$

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\xi_n^4\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}\right]\leqslant ch^{8/5}.$$

Here the error terms are uniform in $n\leqslant n_0$.

Let

$$\delta_n=\xi_n-\mathbf{E}[\xi_n\mid\mathcal{F}_{n-1}].$$

This is clearly a martingale difference sequence. We use the Skorokhod embedding theorem (see Proposition 3.3) to define a standard Brownian motion W_t, generating the filtration $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t$, and a sequence of stopping times $0=\tau_0<\tau_1<\dots$ for W such that

$$W_{\tau_n}-W_{\tau_{n-1}}=\delta_n.$$

It is important that this coupling has the property that it does not look "into the future of the LERW". That is to say, if $\mathcal{G}_n$ denotes the σ-algebra generated by $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau_n}$ and $\mathcal{F}_n$, then the Brownian motion $t\mapsto W_{t+\tau_n}-W_{\tau_n}$ is independent of $\mathcal{G}_n$ and the distribution of the LERW in the future given $\mathcal{G}_n$ is the same as the distribution given $\mathcal{F}_n$.

Since $n_0 = O(h^{-1})$ on the event $n \leqslant n_0$ (which we will assume from now on) we have

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{E}[\xi_j \mid \mathcal{F}_{j-1}]\right] = O(h^{1/5}).$$

Hence by the Markov inequality,

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{E}[\xi_j \mid \mathcal{F}_{j-1}] \geqslant h^{1/10}\right\} = O(h^{1/10}).$$

Therefore, except for an event of probability $O(h^{1/10})$, possibly increasing c,

$$|U_n - W_{\tau_n}| \leqslant ch^{1/10} \qquad \text{for all } n \leqslant n_0. \tag{3.7}$$

This gives (i). We will now compare the capacity increments. We know that

$$\mathbf{E}[\delta_n^2 - (t_{m_n} - t_{m_{n-1}}) \mid \mathcal{G}_{n-1}] = O(h^{6/5})$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}[\delta_n^2 - (\tau_n - \tau_{n-1}) \mid \mathcal{G}_{n-1}] = 0.$$

So we expect that the τ increments are close to the capacity increments which in turn are deterministic, with very large probability. We will show the first part of this by looking at a suitable martingale. For this, note that if

$$\mu_n = t_{m_n} - t_{m_{n-1}}, \quad \nu_n = \tau_n - \tau_{n-1},$$

then we have

$$\mathbf{E}[\mu_n - \nu_n \mid \mathcal{G}_{n-1}] = O(h^{6/5}).$$

Consider the martingale

$$M_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} Y_k,$$

where

$$Y_k = \mu_k - \nu_k - \mathbf{E}[\mu_k - \nu_k \mid \mathcal{G}_{k-1}].$$

Then

$$\mathbf{E}[\mu_n^2 + \nu_n^2 \mid \mathcal{G}_{n-1}] = O(h^{8/5}),$$

and we can sum this estimate to see that

$$\mathbf{E}[M_n^2] = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbf{E}[Y_k^2] = O(h^{3/5}).$$

Hence by Doob's maximal inequality,

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\max_{1\leqslant k\leqslant n}|M_k|\geqslant h^{1/5}\right\}\leqslant h^{-2/5}\,\mathbf{E}[M_n^2]=O(h^{1/5}).$$

Since

$$\max_{1\leqslant k\leqslant n}|t_{m_k}-\tau_k|\leqslant\max_{1\leqslant k\leqslant n}|M_k|+ch^{1/5},$$

we see that except on an event of probability $O(h^{1/5})$ we have

$$\max_{1\leqslant k\leqslant n}|t_{m_k}-\tau_k|\leqslant ch^{1/5}. \tag{3.8}$$

By Lemma 3.1 we know that except on an event of probability $o(h^{1/5})$,

$$\max_{1\leqslant k\leqslant n}|t_{m_k}-kh|\leqslant ch^{1/5},$$

and so we conclude that except on an event of probability $O(h^{1/5})$,

$$\max_{1\leqslant k\leqslant n}|\tau_k-kh|\leqslant ch^{1/5}. \tag{3.9}$$

This gives (ii). For (iii) we can use the last estimate of Proposition 3.3 together with Chebyshev's inequality and (iv) follows from a modulus of continuity estimate for Brownian motion. □

We rephrase the coupling result as follows.

Proposition 3.6. *There is $c<\infty$ such that the following holds. For each N sufficiently large, we can define a domain configuration sequence*

$$\{(A_n,a_n,b),\quad n=0,1,\ldots,n_0\}$$

and a standard Brownian motion $W_t, 0\leqslant t\leqslant 2$, and a sequence of stopping times $\tau_0\leqslant\tau_1\leqslant\cdots\tau_{n_0}$ for the Brownian motion on the same probability space such that the following holds.

- *The distribution of $\{(A_n,a_n,b)\}$ is that of the LERW domains corresponding to $\mathbf{P}_{D_A,a,b}$ sampled at mesoscopic capacity increments, as described above.*
- *Let $\mathcal{G}_n$ denote the σ-algebra generated by $\{(A_j,a_j,b):j=0\ldots,n\}$ and $\{W_t:t\leqslant\tau_n\}$. Then,*

$$\{(A_j,a_j,b):\,j>n\},$$

$$\{W_{t+\tau_n}-W_{\tau_n}:t\geqslant 0\}$$

are conditionally independent of $\mathcal{G}_n$ given (A_n,a_n,b).

- *There exists a stopping time $n_* \leqslant n_0$ with respect to $\{\mathcal{G}_n\}$ such that*

$$\mathbf{P}\{n_* < n_0\} \leqslant c\, h^{1/10},$$

and such that for $n \leqslant n_*$,

$$|W_{\tau_n} - U_n| \leqslant c\, h^{1/10};$$

$$|\tau_n - nh| \leqslant c\, h^{1/5};$$

$$\max_{\tau_{n-1} \leqslant t \leqslant \tau_n} |W_t - W_{\tau_{n-1}}| \leqslant c\, h^{2/5};$$

$$\max_{t \leqslant \tau_n} \max_{t - h^{1/5} \leqslant s \leqslant t} |W_t - W_s| \leqslant c\, h^{1/12}.$$

- *Let K^n be the n:th mesoscopic hull increment in $\mathbb{H}$. For $n \leqslant n_*$, $\operatorname{hcap}[K^n] \leqslant h + h^2$. Moreover, for $n < n_*$, $\operatorname{hcap}[K^n] \geqslant h$.*

Proof of Proposition 3.6. Let c be as in Lemma 3.5. We define n_* to be the minimum of n_0 and the first n such that either of

$$|W_{\tau_n} - U_n| > ch^{1/10};$$

$$|\tau_n - nh| > ch^{1/5};$$

$$\max_{\tau_{n-1} \leqslant t \leqslant \tau_n} |W_t - W_{\tau_{n-1}}| > ch^{2/5};$$

$$\max_{t \leqslant \tau_n} \max_{t - h^{1/5} \leqslant s \leqslant t} |W_t - W_s| > ch^{1/12},$$

$$\operatorname{hcap}(K^n) < h$$

occurs. Note that if $\operatorname{hcap}(K^n) < h$, then $\operatorname{diam}(K^n) \geqslant h^{2/5}$. Hence using Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.1 we see that $\mathbf{P}\{n_* < n_0\} = O(h^{1/10})$. □

3.2 Loewner chains

Given the Brownian motion W_t of Proposition 3.6, there is a corresponding SLE_2 Loewner chain (g_t^{SLE}) obtained by solving the Loewner differential equation with W_t as driving term. The Loewner chain is generated by an SLE_2 path in $\mathbb{H}$ that we denote by $\gamma(t)$. Let $\hat{\gamma}(t) = F^{-1} \circ \gamma(t)$ which is an SLE_2 path from a to b in D_A parametrized by capacity in $\mathbb{H}$. (This parametrization depends on F but we have fixed F.) We write

$$F_n^{\mathrm{SLE}}(z) = (g_{\tau_n}^{\mathrm{SLE}} \circ F)(z) - W_{\tau_n}$$

and

$$F_n^{\mathrm{LERW}}(z) = (g_n \circ F)(z) - U_n.$$

Lemma 3.7. *There is $c < \infty$ such that the following holds. For R sufficiently large, except on an event of probability at most $ch^{1/10}$, we have uniformly in $\zeta \in A$ such that* $\operatorname{Im} F_n^{SLE}(\zeta) \geqslant h^{1/80}$,

$$|F_n^{LERW}(\zeta) - F_n^{SLE}(\zeta)| \leqslant ch^{1/15}.$$

Moreover, if $y \geqslant h^{1/80}$ and $f_n^{LERW} = g_n^{-1}$, $f_{\tau_n}^{SLE} = (g_{\tau_n}^{SLE})^{-1}$, then

$$\left|f_n^{LERW}(z) - f_{\tau_n}^{SLE}(z)\right| \leqslant ch^{1/15}$$

and

$$\left||y|(f_n^{LERW})'(z)| - y|(f_{\tau_n}^{SLE})'(z)|\right| \leqslant ch^{1/15}.$$

Proof. This follows from Proposition 3.6 using Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 2.6 with the choices

$$\varepsilon = h^{1/10}, \quad \delta = h^{1/80}.$$

□

4 Coupling the paths

We continue the study of the coupling of Proposition 3.6 and Lemma 3.7. We will show that with large probability, the LERW and the SLE_2 curves stay close in the supremum norm when they are paramatetrized by capacity. In the process we will also derive an estimate on the maximal diameter increments of both paths. We work in the same set-up as the previous section but we will give some additional notation. In this section it will be convenient to slightly abuse notation and drop the $m_n = m_n(h)$ and simply write

$$\eta^n = \eta^{m_n}, \quad \eta_j^n = \eta_j^{m_n},\ j = 1, 2, \ldots, m_n,$$

for the SAW given by the first n mesoscopic capacity increments of the LERW. We write

$$\eta_\square^n = \bigcup_{x \in \eta^n} \mathcal{S}_x, \quad K_n, \quad K^n = g_{n-1}(K_n),$$

for the thickened LERW in D_A, the corresponding LERW hulls in $\mathbb{H}$, and the nth mesoscopic hull increment in $\mathbb{H}$, respectively. Note that K_n is the hull generated by $F(\eta_\square^n)$, i.e., K_n consists of $F(\eta_\square^n)$ together with points disconnected from ∞ by the set $F(\eta_\square^n)$. Even though η is a simple curve,

$\eta_\square$ may generate a strictly larger hull. The domain D_n is formed by cutting out $F^{-1}(K_n)$ from $D_0 = D_A$. We write

$$a_n = [\eta^n_{l-1}, \eta^n_l], \quad l = |\eta^n|,$$

for the tip edge of η^n; as usual we identify an edge with its midpoint.

The argument follows along the lines of [5]. Let us now fix an analytic domain D and assume that A approximates D in the sense that D_A is the grid domain associated with ND. We write

$$\check{D} = N^{-1} D_A$$

for the scaled domain. We then have corresponding scaled quantities living in $\check{D}$:

$$\check{\eta}, \quad \check{a}_n, \quad \check{\eta}^n_\square, \quad \check{D}_n, \quad \check{\gamma}(t),$$

defined by

$$N^{-1}\eta, \quad N^{-1}a_n, \quad N^{-1}\eta^n_\square, \quad N^{-1}D_n, \quad \check{\varphi}^{-1}(\gamma(t)),$$

respectively, where

$$\check{\varphi}(z) := F(Rz).$$

We also define

$$\varphi(z) : D \to \mathbb{H}, \quad \varphi(a) = 0, \quad \varphi(b) = \infty, \quad |(\varphi^{-1})'(10i)| = 1.$$

Then $\varphi^{-1}(10i) = \check{\varphi}^{-1}(10i) + O(1/R)$.

Since D is analytic, and $\check{D}$ approximates D from the inside, there is a convergence rate for the uniformizing Riemann maps. Write $w = \check{\varphi}^{-1}(10i)$. Let $\psi : D \to \mathbb{D}$ be normalized so that $\psi(w) = 0, \psi'(w) > 0$ and $\check{\psi} : \check{D} \to \mathbb{D}$ be normalized so that $\check{\psi}(w) = 0$, $\check{\psi}'(w) > 0$. Then, (see, e.g., Section V of [23] or Section 8 of [16]) there is a constant c which depends only on D and the choice of w such that

$$\sup_{z \in \check{D}} |\psi(z) - \check{\psi}(z)| \leqslant c \frac{\log R}{R}.$$

This uses both the regularity of D and that we are approximating by a "nice" grid domain $\check{D}$. Let

$$V = \check{\varphi}^{-1}(\mathcal{B}(0, 100)),$$

which is a neighborhood of both a and $\check{a}$. Then it follows that, perhaps with a different c,

$$\sup_{z\in V} |\varphi(z) - \check{\varphi}(z)| \leqslant c\frac{\log R}{R}, \quad 1/c \leqslant |\varphi'(z)| \leqslant c, \quad \forall z \in V. \tag{4.1}$$

Consequently, there is a constant c' such that if $U \subset \mathcal{B}(0, 100)$ is a connected set of diameter bounded by r, then

$$\operatorname{diam}(\check{\varphi}(U)) \leqslant c' \max\{r, (\log R)/R)\}.$$

Note that the traces of the (stopped) LERW $\check{\eta}^{n_0}$ and SLE $\check{\gamma}[0, \tau_{n_0}]$ in $\check{D}$ are contained in V by the definition of n_0. We will implicitly use this fact several times below.

4.1 Regularity estimates

We need some standard estimates on the derivative of the SLE transformation which will give some regularity information for LERW. The first lemma is an easy consequence of Theorem 4.1 of [6]. In order to state the lemma we define the following parameters.

$$\beta_+ = \frac{2(\sqrt{10}-1)}{9} > .48, \quad q(\beta) = -1 + 2\beta + \frac{\beta^2}{4(1+\beta)}.$$

Notice that $q(\beta) > 0$ if $\beta > \beta_+$. If we choose $\beta = .65 > \beta_+$, then $q(\beta) > 1/3$ and $1 - \beta > 1/3$. Fix $T > 0$ and for $0 < y \leqslant 1$, define the random variable

$$M(y) = \sup_{t\in[0,T]} y|(f_t^{\mathrm{SLE}})'(W_t + iy)|, \quad f_t^{\mathrm{SLE}} := (g_t^{\mathrm{SLE}})^{-1}.$$

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose $\beta > \beta_+$ and $q < q(\beta)$. There is a constant $c < \infty$ such that the following holds for each $0 < y_0 < 1$,*

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\sup_{y\in(0,y_0]} y^{\beta-1}M(y) > c\right\} = O(y_0^q). \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. See Appendix A of [5] and set $\kappa = 2$. □

By arguing as in Section 3 of [6], Lemma 4.1 directly implies a uniform Holder continuity estimate for $\gamma(t)$, the SLE path in $\mathbb{H}$. For $0 < y < 1$, define

$$M_\gamma(y) = \sup_{t\in[0,T-y^2]} \sup_{s\in[0,y^2]} |\gamma(t+s) - \gamma(t)|.$$

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose $\beta > \beta_+$ and $q < q(\beta)$. There is a constant $c < \infty$ such that*

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\sup_{y\in(0,y_0]} y^{\beta-1}M_\gamma(y) > c\right\} = O(y_0^q).$$

Proof. Fix $\beta_0 > \beta_+$ and $q_0 < q(\beta)$. Choose β_1 with $\beta_+ < \beta' < \beta_0$ sufficiently close to β_0 so that $q(\beta_1) > q_0$. Then choose q_1 such that $q_0 < q_1 < q(\beta_1)$. We let c_1 be such that (4.2) holds with parameters β, q replaced by β_1, q_1. In other words, for $0 < y_0 < 1$, the event

$$\sup_{y\in(0,y_0]} y^{\beta_1-1}M(y) \leqslant c_1$$

holds with probability at least $1 - c_1 y_0^{q_1}$. On this event we can then argue as in [5]. □

Lemma 4.3. *We have*

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\max_{n\leqslant n_0} \operatorname{diam}\left(\gamma[\tau_n, \tau_{n-1}]\right) > h^{1/30}\right\} = O(h^{1/30}).$$

Proof. First note that except on an event of probability $O(h^{1/5})$, we have the very rough bound

$$\max_{n\leqslant n_0} |\tau_n - \tau_{n-1}| \leqslant ch^{1/5}.$$

We apply Lemma 4.2 with $y_0 = 2h^{1/10}$ and $\beta = .65$ so that $1 - \beta > 1/3$ and $q > 1/3$. □

We continue with a regularity estimate for LERW. Let I_n be the closure of the smallest interval containing $g^n(\partial K^n)$. Write u_n for the midpoint of I_n and

$$\delta := h^{1/80}, \quad z_n := f_n^{\mathrm{LERW}}(u_n + i\delta).$$

Note that on the event that $\operatorname{diam} K^n \leqslant h^{2/5}$, we have $|I_n| \leqslant ch^{2/5}$. We can think about the Loewner process u_n as a (mesoscopic scale) driving term for the LERW, albeit u_n is measurable with respect to the SAW and not the other way around.

Lemma 4.4. *If*

$$d_n = \operatorname{dist}(z_n, \partial H_n),$$

then

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\max_{n\leqslant n_0} d_n > \delta^{1/3}\right\} = o(\delta^{1/3}). \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. By distortion estimates $d_n \asymp \delta|(f_n^{\mathrm{LERW}})'(u_n+i\delta)|$. Let E be the event that

$$\max_{n\leqslant n_0} \delta|(f_{\tau_n}^{\mathrm{SLE}})'(W_{\tau_n}+i\delta)| \leqslant \delta^{1/3};$$

$$\max_{n\leqslant n_0} \left|\delta|(f_n^{\mathrm{LERW}})'(u_n+i\delta)| - \delta|(f_{\tau_n}^{\mathrm{SLE}})'(u_n+i\delta)|\right| \leqslant h^{1/15};$$

$$\max_{n\leqslant n_0} |W_{\tau_n}-u_n| \leqslant h^{2/5}.$$

Using distortion estimates again, we see that $d_n \leqslant c\delta^{1/3}$ holds on E. But from Lemma 4.1, Proposition 2.6 and the fact that $|I_n| \leqslant ch^{2/5}$ in the coupling, we have $\mathbf{P}\{E^c\} = o(\delta^{1/3})$. □

We would now like to say that the distance between $F(a_n)$, the image in $\mathbb{H}$ of the tip of the LERW, and the point z_n is small. This would then allow us to gauge the distance between the LERW tip to the SLE tip by a "4ε-argument" using the estimates from Section 2. The obvious strategy is to try to estimate the length of the hyperbolic geodesic connecting $F(a_n)$ with z_n. For the SLE we can do this by integrating the "microscopic $y \to 0+$"-derivative estimate of Lemma 4.1, but for LERW we do not have this sort of estimate. What we know is that d_n is small. That is, we know that the distance to *some* point on the boundary is small, but we are interested in the distance to a particular point. It is not hard to draw curves for which d_n is small but the distance to z_n is large – think of a curve which creates a large bottleneck close to z_n (but with z_n outside the "bottle") and then enters and travels far into the "bottle". So for this to work we need to use some regularity property of LERW. The first step is a geometric argument which will allow us to estimate the diameter of the geodesic in terms of d_n on the event that certain crossing events do not occur. The second step is to prove that such crossing events are unlikely for LERW. We also get a Holder-type estimate for LERW in the capacity parameterization on a coarse enough scale.

A crosscut of a simply connected domain D is a continuous simple curve $\sigma = (\sigma(t), t \in [0,1])$ such that $\sigma(0+), \sigma(1-) \in \partial D$ and $\sigma(t) \in D$, $t \in (0,1)$.

Lemma 4.5. *There exists $1 < r_0 < \infty$ such that the following holds. Suppose $h < 1/r_0$. For every $n \leqslant n_0$, $\partial\mathcal{B}(z_n, r_0 d_n)$ contains a crosscut of H_{n-1} that separates z_n and $f_{n-1}^{LERW}(K^n)$ from ∞ in H_{n-1}.*

Proof. We write $f_n = f_n^{\mathrm{LERW}}$. We can assume $u_n = 0$, so that I_n is centered around 0. Note that $\mathrm{hm}(i\delta, I_n, \mathbb{H}) \leqslant ch^{3/10}$, where c does not depend on A, n and hm refers to harmonic measure. We claim that if h satisfies $ch^{3/10} \leqslant 1/4$,

then if J is any bounded open interval with $\mathrm{hm}(i\delta, J, \mathbb{H}) > 3/4$ we have that $I_n \subset J$. Indeed,

$$\mathrm{hm}(i\delta, I_n, \mathbb{H}) \leqslant 1/4$$

implies

$$\mathrm{hm}(i\delta, I_n \cup \mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{H}) = \mathrm{hm}(i\delta, I_n \cup \mathbb{R}_-, \mathbb{H}) \leqslant 5/8 < 3/4.$$

For each $r > 1$, let Σ be the collection of crosscuts of H_n formed by the elements of $\partial\mathcal{B}(z_n, rd_n) \cap H_n$. The crosscuts in Σ have disjoint interiors, and, being crosscuts, they each partition H_n into exactly two components, one bounded and one unbounded (since $\eta^n_\square$ is bounded). Since $\partial\mathcal{B}(z_n, rd_n) \cap H_n$ separates z_n from ∞ in H_n, Σ contains at least one crosscut which separates z_n from ∞ in H_n. Let σ be the unique crosscut in Σ which: *a*) separates z_n from ∞ in H_n, and *b*) if $\sigma \neq \sigma' \in \Sigma$ and σ' also separates z_n from ∞ in H_n, then σ separates σ' from ∞ in H_n. Write Ω for the bounded component of $H_n \setminus \sigma$, and $E = \partial\Omega \setminus \sigma$. Then Ω is a simply connected domain and $z_n \in \Omega$. By the Beurling projection theorem and the maximum principle, we can find a universal $r' < \infty$ such that if $r > r'/2$ then $\mathrm{hm}(z_n, E, \Omega) > 3/4$. Choose $r_0 = r'$ and let $\sigma = \sigma_{r_0}$. Then $g_n(\sigma)$ is a (bounded) crosscut of $\mathbb{H}$ which separates $i\delta$ and an interval J from ∞. By conformal invariance and the maximum principle, $\mathrm{hm}(i\delta, J, \mathbb{H}) > 3/4$. Consequently, by the first paragraph of the proof, $I_n \subset J$. From this we conclude that σ separates z_n and $f_{n-1}(K^n)$ from ∞ in H_n. Since $H_n = H_{n-1} \setminus f_{n-1}(K^n)$ and $f_{n-1}(K^n)$ is disjoint from σ, it follows that σ also separates $f_{n-1}(K^n)$ and z_n from ∞ in H_{n-1}. □

We now quote two results from [16] that we will use in the proof of the regularity estimate for LERW. Here we write $\mathcal{A}_r$ for triples (A, a, b) where A is a $\mathbb{Z}^2$ lattice domain with boundary edges a, b as before but with the added requirement that A contains $C_r = \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : |z| < r\}$. We write I_r for the set of self-avoiding walks that include at least one vertex in C_r. The next proposition describes the bottleneck event.

Proposition 4.6. *There exist $c < \infty$ such that the following holds. Suppose $0 < r < R$ and $(A, a, b) \in \mathcal{A}_r$ with $|a_+| < r$. Let*

$$E'' = E''(0, r, R)$$

denote the set of $\eta = [\eta_0, \ldots, \eta_n] \in \mathcal{W}_A(a, b)$ such that there exists $0 < j_1 < k_1 < j_2 < k_2 < n$, with $|\eta_{j_1}|, |\eta_{j_2}| \geqslant R$ and $|\eta_{k_1}|, |\eta_{k_2}| \leqslant r$. Then

$$\mathbf{P}_{A,a,b}\{E''\} \leqslant c\,(r/R)^2.$$

Proof. See Section 6 of [16]. □

Remark. Section 6 of [16] also proves a similar result where the event E'' is replaced by the event $E' = E'(0, r, R)$ that the path starts at distance r from 0, gets away to distance R and then returns to distance r again. The bound in this case is $O(r/R)$. In fact, the proofs of these two estimates are nearly the same and are both contained in Proposition 6.16 of [16] which estimates the corresponding probability for random walk conditioned to exit at b.

Proposition 4.7. *If $(A, a, b) \in \mathcal{A}_{2r}$, then*

$$\mathbf{P}_{A,a,b}\{0 \in \eta \mid \eta \in I_r\} \asymp r^{-3/4}, \tag{4.4}$$

and hence

$$\mathbf{P}_{A,a,b}[I_r] \asymp r^{3/4}\, \mathbf{P}_{A,a,b}\{0 \in \eta\}. \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. See Section 6 of [16] □

Recall that we have defined $\delta = h^{1/80}$.

Proposition 4.8. *There are constants c_1, c_2 such that if $r = c_1\delta^{1/3}$, then*

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\max_{n \leqslant n_0} \left[\operatorname{diam}\left(\check{\eta}^n_\square \smallsetminus \check{\eta}^{n-1}_\square\right)\right] > r^{1/8}\right\} \leqslant c_2 r^{1/6}$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\max_{n \leqslant n_0} |F(a_n) - z_n| > r^{1/8}\right\} \leqslant c_2 r^{1/6}. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. The idea is to use Lemma 4.5 to see that the event that the diameter of $\check{\eta}^n_\square \smallsetminus \check{\eta}^{n-1}_\square$ is large implies the existence of a bottleneck event for the LERW of the type considered in Proposition 4.6. By covering the domain with annuli we can then show that the probability that such a crossing occurs is small.

We will use notation from the proof of Lemma 4.5. We write $A(z, r, R)$ for the annulus about z having boundary components with radiii r, R and we will write

$$\Delta_n = \eta^n_\square \smallsetminus \eta^{n-1}_\square$$

for the n:th increment of the thickened LERW. By (4.3) there is a constant $c < \infty$ (which does not depend on n) such that except on an event of probability $O(\delta^{1/3})$, $d_n \leqslant c\delta^{1/3}$. Therefore, by Lemma 4.5, there is an $1 < r_0 < \infty$ and a crosscut $\sigma \subset \partial\mathcal{B}(z_n, r_0 d_n)$ which separates $F(\Delta_n)$ from

∞ in H_{n-1}. Let $\check{\sigma} = \check{\varphi}^{-1}(\sigma)$. Then by (4.1), there is a constant c (which depends only on $\check{D}$ and the choice of F) such that $\check{\sigma} \subset A(\check{z}_n, r_0 d_n/c, c r_0 d_n)$. Let

$$r := c r_0 d_n, \quad R := r^{1/8}$$

and note that $r = O(\delta^{1/3})$. (We are reusing notation here, but in the course of the proof we will only refer to R as just defined, and not to $|F'(10i)|$ as before.)

Ler us now assume that $\operatorname{diam}\left(\check{\eta}^n_\square \smallsetminus \check{\eta}^{n-1}_\square\right) \geqslant R$. We will argue that this forces a bottleneck event of the type descibed in Proposition 4.6 to occur.

Suppose first that $\operatorname{dist}(\check{z}, \partial\check{D}) \geqslant 4r$. Then $\check{\sigma}$ does not intersect $\partial\check{D}$ since it is contained in the ball of radius r about $\check{z}_n$. By modifying $\check{\sigma}$ slightly we can assume that $\check{\sigma}$ touches $\check{\eta}^n_\square$ in exactly two distinct squares. Let

$$j^* = \min\{j \geqslant 0 : \check{\eta}^n_\square(j) \cap \check{\sigma} \neq \emptyset\}, \quad k^* = \max\{j \geqslant 0 : \check{\eta}^n_\square(j) \cap \check{\sigma} \neq \emptyset\}.$$

We know that $\check{\sigma}$ separates Δ_n from b. Since $\check{\sigma}$ does not touch Δ_n nor $\partial\check{D}$ the assumption $\operatorname{diam}\Delta_n \geqslant R$ implies that we must have $\operatorname{diam}\check{\eta}_\square[j^*, k^*] \geqslant R - r \geqslant R/2$. We have $\Delta_n \subset \check{\eta}_\square[k^*+1, m_n]$ and hence $\operatorname{diam}\check{\eta}_\square[k^*+1, m_n] \geqslant R$. (Here we also remark that $|z_n - F(a_n)| \leqslant 2r + \operatorname{diam}\check{\eta}_\square[k^*+1, m_n]$, which will give (4.6).) Another way to phrase this is as follows: η^n gets to distance r of $\check{z}_n$ (at time j^*), then gets away to distance at least $R/2$, returns to distance r (before time k^*), then gets away to distance at least $R/2$ a second time in order for $\operatorname{diam}\Delta_n \geqslant R$. This is not yet a bottleneck event of type E'', but since the path continues to b and $\check{\sigma}$ separates the tip from b, the path must return to distance r from $\check{z}_n$ a third time. The conclusion is that the assumption that $\operatorname{diam}\Delta_n \geqslant R$ implies that the bottleneck event $E''(\check{z}_n, r, R/2)$ occurs in the case when $\operatorname{dist}(\check{z}_n, \partial\check{D}) \geqslant 4r$. We estimate the probability that there occurs a bottleneck event as just described. For this it will be useful to consider two cases. Let

$$U = \left\{z \in \mathbb{H} : r^{1/3} \leqslant |z| \leqslant 100\right\}, \quad \check{U} = \check{\varphi}^{-1}(U_r).$$

We first estimate the event that there exists $w \in \check{U}$ such that $1_{E''(w,r,R/2)} = 1$. If such a w exists there exists a point w' on the grid $(r/2)\,\mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $1_{E''(w',2r,R/3)} = 1$. Using Proposition 4.7 we can see that the probability that $\check{\eta}$ gets to distance $2r$ from a fixed point $w' \in U$ is $O(r^{1/2})$. Given this, by Proposition 4.6, the probability that $E''(w', 2r, R/3)$ occurs is $O((r/r^{1/8})^2) = O(r^{7/4})$. We can then cover $\check{U}$ by $O(r^{-2})$ balls and apply these bounds for the center of each ball to see that except on an event of probability $O(r^{1/4})$ there will be no point $w \in \check{U}$ such that $1_{E''(w,r,R/2)} = 1$.

For points whose image in $\mathbb{H}$ is at distance $r^{1/3}$ from 0 (but still at distance at least $4r$ from $\partial\check{D}$) we estimate the probability of getting to distance $2r$ by 1 and then proceed as above. The resulting bound on the probability of a bottleneck is of order $r^{-2+2/3+7/4} = r^{5/12}$.

It remains to consider the case when $\operatorname{dist}(\check{z}_n, \partial\check{D}) < 4r$. We know from the uniform derivative estimate for the SLE that the tip of the SLE coupled to the LERW at time τ_n (which is near z_n) is at distance $O(r)$ from $\partial\mathbb{H}$. Therefore, since the boundary exponent for SLE_2 equals 3, the probability that such an event occurs for $z_n \in U$ is of order $r^{3(1-1/3)} = r^2$. (We could also have estimated using random walk.) Finally, for the remaining case when z_n is not in U but near $\partial\mathbb{H}$ the image of the LERW must get to distance R from 0 and return to distance $r^{1/3}$. The proability of this event can be estimated by the probability of the same event for random walk excursion. This way we get a bound of order $r^{1/3-1/8} = r^{5/24}$. This completes the proof.

□

4.2 Putting the estimates together

Theorem 4.9. *Let r be as in Proposition 4.8. We have*

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\max_{n\leqslant n_0}\{|\check{\gamma}(\tau_n) - \check{a}_n|\} > r^{1/8}\right\} = O(r^{1/6}).$$

If $\check{\gamma}(t), \check{\eta}(t)$ are the continuous curves parametrized by capacity, then

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\sup_{0\leqslant t\leqslant 1}|\check{\gamma}(t) - \check{\eta}(t)| > r^{1/8}\right\} = O(r^{1/6}).$$

Proof. Using (4.1), Lemma 4.4 and Proposition 4.8, we see that there is an event E with $\mathbf{P}\{E^c\} = O(r^{1/6})$ on which we have the estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
|\check{\gamma}(\tau_n) - \check{a}_n| &\leqslant c\,|\gamma(\tau_n) - f^{\mathrm{SLE}}_{\tau_n}(W_{\tau_n} + i\delta)| + c\,|F(a_n) - f^{\mathrm{SLE}}_{\tau_n}(W_{\tau_n} + i\delta)| \\
&\leqslant O(\delta^{1/3}) + |F(a_n) - z_n| + |z_n - f^{\mathrm{SLE}}_{\tau_n}(W_{\tau_n} + i\delta)| \\
&\leqslant O(r^{1/8}) + |z_n - f^{\mathrm{SLE}}_{\tau_n}(W_{\tau_n} + i\delta)| \\
&\leqslant O(r^{1/8}) + |z_n - f^{\mathrm{SLE}}_{\tau_n}(u_n + i\delta)| + |f^{\mathrm{SLE}}_{\tau_n}(u_n + i\delta) - f^{\mathrm{SLE}}_{\tau_n}(W_{\tau_n} + i\delta)| \\
&= O(r^{1/8}).
\end{aligned}$$

This gives the first assertion. By Lemma 3.4 the event that $\operatorname{hcap}\eta^{n_0} \geqslant 2$ has probability $1 - o(r^{1/6})$. Since we know that $\operatorname{diam}\eta^{n_0} \leqslant 2$ the Beurling estimate implies $\operatorname{hcap}\eta^n \leqslant \operatorname{hcap}\eta^n_\square \leqslant \operatorname{hcap}\eta^n + O(N^{-1/2})$. The second assertion follows. □

5 Proof of Lemma 3.1

Lemma 5.1. *There exists $c > 0$ such that the following holds. Let σ_r be the first index j such that $\operatorname{Im}[F(\eta_j)] \geqslant 2r$. Then for $R^{-1/4} \leqslant r \leqslant c$,*

$$\mathbf{P}_{A,a,b}\{-r \leqslant \operatorname{Re}[\eta_j] \leqslant r \text{ for all } j \leqslant \sigma_r\} \geqslant c.$$

We note that $\operatorname{hcap}(\eta[0,\sigma_r]) \geqslant r^2$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{\omega}$ denote the excursion so that $\eta = \mathrm{LE}[\tilde{\omega}]$, and for ease of notation let use write $\omega_k = F[\tilde{\omega}_k]$.

We first consider the following event for the random walk excursion. Let ρ be the first j with $\operatorname{Im}[\omega_j] \geqslant 4r$ and consider the event that

$$-r \leqslant \operatorname{Re}[\omega_j] \leqslant r, \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant \rho,$$

$$\operatorname{Im}[\omega_j] \geqslant 3r, \quad \rho \leqslant j < \infty.$$

Note that on this event, if η is the loop-erasure of ω, then

$$-r \leqslant \operatorname{Re}[\eta_j] \leqslant r, \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant \sigma_r.$$

Hence, we need to show that this event on excursions has positive probability. The hard work was done in [9, Proposition 3.14] where it is shown that there exists c' such that with positive probability, if ρ is the first time j that the excursion reaches $\{\operatorname{Im}(z) \geqslant c'r\}$, then $\max\{|\operatorname{Re}(\omega_j)| : 0 \leqslant j \leqslant \rho\} \leqslant r/2$. (That paper considers the map to the unit disk rather than the upper half plane, but the result can easily be adapted by mapping the disk to the half plane.) Given this event, the remainder of the path can be extended using the invariance principle. Indeed, this follows from the following facts about the Poisson kernel. Let us consider

$$V = V(A,h) = \{\zeta \in A : F(\zeta) \in \{|z| \leqslant 5r\}.$$

$$V_- = V_-(A,r) = \{\zeta \in V : \operatorname{Im}[F(\zeta)] \leqslant r\},$$

$$V_+ = V_+(A,r) = \{\zeta \in V : \operatorname{Im}[F(\zeta)] \geqslant 2r\}.$$

Then by combining (1) and (41) of [9] , we can see that for R sufficiently large and $R^{-1/4} \leqslant r \leqslant R^{-\varepsilon}$, we have for all $\zeta_+ \in V_+, \zeta_- \in V_-$,

$$H_A(\zeta_+, b) \geqslant \frac{3}{2} H_A(\zeta_-, b). \tag{5.1}$$

In fact, one can show that there is $u > 0$ such that

$$\frac{H_A(\zeta_+, b)}{H_A(\zeta_-, b)} = \frac{\text{Im } F(\zeta_+)}{\text{Im } F(\zeta_-)} \, (1 + O(R^{-u}))$$

so, allowing for the small error, the quotient is at least 3/2. This estimate implies that the probability that an excursion starting at $\zeta \in V_+$ with probability at least 1/3 does not visit V_-.

□

We now complete the proof of Lemma 3.1. Let ξ_1 be the first j such that $|F(\eta_j)| \geqslant 4r$. Using the Beurling estimate, we have $|F(\eta_j)| \leqslant 4r + O(R^{-1/2}) \leqslant 5r$. Let $F_1 = g_1 \circ F$ where $g_1 : F(D_{A_{\xi_1}}) \to \mathbb{H}$ with $g(a_1) = 0$ and $g_1(z) \sim z$ as $z \to \infty$. Inductively, we define ξ_k to be the first $j = j_k$ such that $|F_{k-1}(\eta_j)| \geqslant 4r$, and define F_k in the same way. Let J be the first k such that

$$\text{Im } [F_{k-1}(\eta_{j_k})] \geqslant 2r.$$

Using the previous lemma, we see that

$$\mathbf{P}\{J \geqslant k\} \leqslant e^{-\alpha k},$$

for some $\alpha > 0$. In particular, for R sufficiently large,

$$\mathbf{P}\{J \geqslant r^{-1/15}\} \leqslant \exp\{-\alpha \lfloor r^{-1/15} \rfloor\} \leqslant \exp\{r^{-1/20}\}.$$

Note that $\text{hcap}[F(\eta_{\xi_J})] \geqslant \text{hcap}\,[F_{J-1}(\eta_J)] \geqslant r^2$. We also claim that there exists a universal $c_1 < \infty$ such that

$$\text{diam}\,[F(\eta[0, \xi_J])] \leqslant c_1 J r.$$

This is a fact about the Loewner equation. More generally, suppose that $K_1 \subset K_2 \subset \cdots$ is an increasing sequence of connected hulls in $\mathbb{H}$ with corresponding maps $g_j : \mathbb{H} \setminus K_j \to \mathbb{H}$. Suppose also that for each j, $g_{j-1}(K_j \setminus K_{j-1})$ is connected. For any connected hull K (see [10, (3.14)]) we compare the diameter with the (potential theoretic) capacity:

$$\text{diam}(K) \asymp \text{cap}_{\mathbb{H}}(K) := \lim_{y \to \infty} y \, \mathbf{P}^{iy}\{B_T \in K\},$$

where B is a complex Brownian motion and

$$T = T_K = \inf\{t : B_t \in K \cup \mathbb{R}\}.$$

If $T_j = T_{K_j}$ with $T_0 = T_\emptyset$, then

$$\mathbf{P}^{iy}(K_k) = \mathbf{P}^{iy}\{T_k < T_0\} \leqslant \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathbf{P}^{iy}\{T_j < T_{j-1}\}.$$

Using conformal invariance of Brownian motion and the fact that $g_{j-1}(iy) = iy + O(1)$, we can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{y\to\infty} y\, \mathbf{P}^{iy}\{T_j < T_{j-1}\} &= \lim_{y\to\infty} y\, \mathbf{P}^{g_{j-1}(iy)}\{B(T_{g_{j-1}(K_j \setminus K_{j-1})}) \notin \mathbb{R}\} \\ &= \mathrm{cap}_{\mathbb{H}}[g_{j-1}(K_j \setminus K_{j-1})], \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{diam}(K_k) \leqslant c\, \mathrm{cap}_{\mathbb{H}}(K_k) &\leqslant c \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathrm{cap}_{\mathbb{H}}[g_{j-1}(K_j \setminus K_{j-1})] \\ &\leqslant c \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathrm{diam}\left[g_{j-1}(K_j \setminus K_{j-1})\right]. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof.

References

[1] Martin Barlow, David Croydon, Takashi Kumagai, *Subsequential scaling limits of simple random walk on the two-dimensional uniform spanning tree*, To appear in Annals of Probability.

[2] Christian Beneš, Gregory Lawler, Fredrik Viklund, *Scaling limit of the loop-erased random walk Green's function*, Probab. Theory Related Fields, 166 (1), 271-319 (2016)

[3] Christian Beneš, Fredrik Johansson Viklund, Michael Kozdron, *On the rate of conference of loop-erased random walk to SLE_2*, Comm. Math. Phys, 308 (2), 307-354 (2013)

[4] Stephane Benoist, Laure Dumaz, Wendelin Werner, *Near-critical spanning forests and renormalization*, Preprint 2015.

[5] Fredrik Johansson Viklund, *Convergence rates for loop-erased random walk and other Loewner curves*, Annals of Probability, 43 (1), 119-165 (2015).

[6] Fredrik Johansson Viklund, Gregory F. Lawler, *Optimal Hölder exponent for the SLE path*, Duke Math. J., 159, No. 3, 351–383 (2011).

[7] Fredrik Johansson Viklund, Gregory F. Lawler, *Almost sure multifractal spectrum for the tip of an SLE curve*, Acta Math. 209, 265-322 (2012).

[8] Fredrik Johansson Viklund, Steffen Rohde, Carto Wong *On the continuity of SLE_κ in κ*, Probab. Theory Rel. Fields, 159, No. 3, 413–433 (2014).

[9] Michael J. Kozdron and Gregory F. Lawler, Estimates of random walk exit probabilities and applications to loop-erased random walk, Electr. J. Probab. (2005), Paper no. 44, 1442–1467.

[10] Gregory F. Lawler, *Conformally Invariant Processes in the Plane*, AMS Press (2006).

[11] Gregory F. Lawler, *Continuity of radial and two-sided radial SLE at the terminal point*

[12] Gregory F. Lawler, Laurence Field, *Escape probability and transience for SLE*, Electronic Journal of Probability 20 (2015), no. 10, 1-14,

[13] Gregory F. Lawler, Vlada Limic, *Random Walk: a Modern Introduction*, Cambridge U. Press (2010).

[14] Gregory F. Lawler, Scott Sheffield, *A natural parametrization for the Schramm-Loewner evolution* Ann. Probab. Volume 39, Number 5 (2011), 1896-1937.

[15] Gregory F. Lawler, Oded Schramm, Wendelin Werner, *Conformal invariance of planar loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees*, Ann. Probab. Volume 32, Number 1B (2004), 939–995.

[16] Gregory F. Lawler, Fredrik Viklund, *Convergence of loop-erased random walk in the natural parametrization*, preprint 2016

[17] Gregory F. Lawler, Wang Zhou, *SLE curves and natural parametrization*, Ann. Probab, Volue 41 Number 3A (2013), 1556–1584.

[18] Gregory F. Lawler, Mohammad A. Rezaei, *Minkowski content and natural parameterization for the Schramm-Loewner evolution*, Ann. Probab. Volume 43, Number 3 (2015), 1082-1120.

[19] Robert Masson, *The growth exponent for planar loop-erased random walk*, Electron. j. Prob. **14**, Article No. 36 (2009).

[20] Steffen Rohde, Oded Schramm, *Basic Properties of SLE*, Ann. Math., **161** (2005), 883–924.

[21] Oded Schramm, *Scaling limits of loop-erased walks and uniform spanning trees*, Israel J. Math. 118(1) 221-288 (2000).

[22] Oded Schramm, David B. Wilson, *SLE coordinate changes*, New York Journal of Mathematics 11, 659-669 (2005).

[23] S. E. Warschawsi, *On the degree of variation in conformal mapping of variable regions*, Trans. AMS, 69(2), 335–356 (1950).

[24] Dapeng Zhan, *The scaling limits of planar LERW in finitely connected domains*, Ann. Probab., 36(2):467-529, 2008.

(Lawler) Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago
E-mail address: lawler@math.uchicago.edu

(Viklund) Department of Matematics, KTH Royal Institute of Technology
E-mail address: fredrik.viklund@math.kth.se